

VOL. XX

APRIL, 1943

No. 2

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS.



Editor: RIGHT REV. E. J. O'DONNELL, D.D.

St. Columba's College, Springwood.

Manager: REV. R. B. COUGHLAN.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

CORRESPONDENCE: All correspondence should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited.

SUBSCRIPTIONS—Price: single copy, 3/6; yearly, *in advance*, 12/-: Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque (with exchange added).

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests have been appointed to act as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C. Record Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. W. J. Walsh, Opunake, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. B. Bolton, P.P., Kelvin Grove, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tasmania.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. M. Tully, Adm., Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Auckland, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Rev. J. P. Walsh, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—Rev. M. J. Dunne, Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. C. J. Collins, P.P., Forbury, N.Z.

Diocese of Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, Goulburn, N.S.W.

Diocese of Lismore—Very Rev. T. Morris, Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Very Rev. P. C. McCormack, P.P., Singleton, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—Rev. M. J. Dolan, Adm., Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Cowwarr, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. J. Madden, D.D., Toowoomba, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—Rev. P. Gahan, Coolamon, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Geraldton, W.A.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:


THE NATURE AND PERFECTION OF GOD	
Rev. J. O'Rourke, O.P.	65
JOCELIN OF BRAKELOND AND MEDIEVAL MONASTIC LIFE	Rev. T. Armstrong 78
LAY APOSTOLATE IN THE FORCES	
Rev. C. Mayne, S.J.	92
"— OR A SODALITY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT"	Rev. W. A. Fox, S.S.S. 103
IN DIEBUS ILLIS	John O'Brien 113
LITURGY	Rev. J. Carroll, D.C.L. 126
Mysteries of the Rosary to be said on Sundays—Veil of Ciborium— Veil of Monstrance—Distributing Holy Communion in black vest- ments—Holy Communion taken privately to the sick in hospitals.	
BOOK REVIEWS—	
<i>Things in me that make me a believer</i> (W. V. McEvoy, O.P.)	77
<i>Mary of Bethlehem and Other Poems</i> (Mary King)	102
<i>The Person of Jesus</i> (Father James, O.F.M. Cap.)	132
<i>The Story of Bishop Salvado</i> (John T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D.) ..	135

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER,

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

 NORMANNUS,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

The Nature and Perfection of God

Summary: Agnosticism and Anthropomorphism.—Difference between knowledge of a thing's existence, and knowledge of its essence.—Univocal and analogical agents.—The perfection of concepts.—Knowledge of God's Essence by way of negation.—The Simplicity of God.—Knowledge of God through the avenue opened up by reflection on the principle of extrinsic formal causality.—The Perfection of God.—His Physical Essence.—His Metaphysical Essence.—The Name of God.

"When the existence of a thing has been ascertained, there remains the further question of the manner of its existence, in order that what it is may be known. Now, because we cannot know what God is, but rather what He is not, we have no means for considering how God is, but rather how He is not." With this paradox St. Thomas approaches the difficult problem which it is our purpose to study in this article. Logically the study of the essence or of the nature of a thing follows the discovery of its existence, therefore, after demonstrating the existence of God in the Third Question of his *Summa* St. Thomas in the following Questions proceeds to investigate the problem of His Essence. After demonstrating that the question, Is God? must be answered affirmatively, he directs his mental energies to the formulating of a satisfactory answer to the question, What is God? Obviously this is a more difficult problem. Most people admit the existence of God, but how few there are who have a clear idea of Him! The general admission of His existence, and the divergent opinions about His Nature show the difficulty of the problem which we intend investigating with St. Thomas' help.

AGNOSTICISM and ANTHROPOMORPHISM.

We can reduce all the erroneous opinions about the nature of God to two, Agnosticism and Anthropomorphism. According to the Agnostic we can know nothing of the nature of God, we can have no idea at all of what God is. All those who deny the ontological value of our ideas must perforce adopt this stand, unless illogically they take refuge in a sentimentalism that is wholly subjective, and which creates in the subjective conscience according to the wants of the individual a god that is no more than a gratifying day-dream. The Anthropomorphists, on the other hand, attribute to God the limitations of man. This does not mean merely that they use anthropomorphic language, which we all find it difficult to avoid, but that they uphold a theory that predicates of God not merely metaphorically, but literally, terms that are expressive of

human limitation and potentiality. All who hold that we can know the divine essence as it is in itself even while we are still on this earth stand accused of anthropomorphism, for they attach a literal meaning to words that we apply to God analogically or only metaphorically. In theory Anthropomorphism sounds very absurd, but in practice it is to be found much more commonly than Agnosticism.

To-day outside the Catholic Church many who call themselves Christians have the grossest misconceptions of the nature of God, misconceptions which may be reduced to either of the categories referred to above. Our subject, therefore, is not a vain speculation, but a problem of practical importance. Not only is it important that we ourselves should know what God is, and see the limitations of our knowledge of Him, but that we should be able to enlighten others about this matter concerning which so many remain in ignorance and superstition, for Agnosticism is the ignorance of pride, and Anthropomorphism is the superstition of ignorance.

We have to answer the question, what is God? From the outset let us distinguish clearly between the knowledge we can have of the existence of a thing, and the knowledge we can have of the essence of the same thing. To know that a thing is, and to know what it is, are not the same. When we say that we know *what* a thing is, we mean that we know its essence and that we can define it more or less accurately. If we mean that we know it to the extent of being able to define it according to its essential attributes, and that we can assign the radical principle of its properties, our knowledge attains the essence of the thing, and the idea that we possess of it is so clear, full and characteristic, that nothing is left for further investigation. Now we cannot know what God is in this searching way. In a previous article* it was explained and demonstrated that the existence of God cannot be proved by an *a priori* or *quasi-a-priori* process of reasoning. It was shown that from our idea of God we cannot deduce the fact of His existence. The reason we assigned for this was that God's essence is not within the scope of our intellect as an object proportionate to it. It was pointed out that we could not prove the existence of God *a priori* unless we knew the essence of God, and saw, that existence was included in that essence. Therefore, in proving that an aprioristic knowledge of God's existence is not possible for us here on earth, it was proved that we cannot strictly know

*Cp. The Australasian Catholic Record, July, 1940.

what God is, for an aprioristic demonstration of God's existence would have to proceed from a clear knowledge of His essence. Such a knowledge would have to be acquired from objective reality, that is from the object, God, actually existing; now this would be impossible, since there is no proportion between the object, uncreated being; and the faculty of our knowledge, a created intellect. The object proportionate to our intellect is created being, and in this life the object proportionate to our intellect is being abstracted from sensible things. Obviously God cannot be placed in either category, though from a knowledge of His effects in both categories we can arise to a knowledge of His existence, and as we shall see, to a limited knowledge of *what* He is. St. Thomas writes in his commentary on the treatise of Boetius on the Trinity: "In our present state our intellect cannot know God from the form which is His essence, though in this manner He is known by the Blessed in heaven. In this life God is not known to us at all by purely intelligible species. It remains, therefore, that He is known to us by His effects." Does this mean that we can know nothing at all of God's essence? By no means. It means that we cannot have an idea or concept of God the same as we have a concept of those things which by a process of abstraction the mind can present immediately to itself, such as our concept of man or of any material thing. In the same commentary St. Thomas proceeds to explain that we can have some idea of what God is, because God's effects supply us with fragments of information, which, pieced together, give us an idea of what He is; imperfect, though this idea is, it is applicable to Him alone. St. Thomas writes: "There are two kinds of effects: one which is in perfect proportion to the power of its cause, and from such an effect the full power of the agent and its essence are known. The other is an effect that lacks this complete proportion to its cause, and from this effect the power of the agent and its essence cannot be comprehended, and the effects points only to the existence of its cause. In this way every effect has reference to God." Technically these two kinds of effects to which St. Thomas alludes are known as univocal and analogical, or to be more accurate, these terms are applied to these two kinds of causes with reference to their respective effects. When a cause has as its effect the specific reproduction of itself, it is univocal; when a cause has as its effect something that is not specifically the same, though not sufficiently dissimilar to be termed equivocal, for it reproduces some likeness of itself, it is analogical.

This likeness of analogy exists between God and what He has caused. "There cannot be equality between the divine effects and the infinite virtue of power that produced them, and they can be only imperfect and faint images of this power, so that they present as multiplied and divided the attributes which are present in the First Cause in an absolutely simple unity." Our idea of God, consequently, represents Him not according to His essence as He is in Himself, but according as the works He has made portray Him.

Logic teaches us about the perfection of concepts, that with regard to their excellence in representing things in and to the mind, they may be either indefinite or definite. An indefinite concept really tells one very little about a thing, and is sometimes called infinite, because it sets no limits whereby one can have a positive notion or idea; it is the most imperfect kind of concept, telling one merely what a thing is not. On the other hand a definite concept gives one some positive information about a thing, though this information may be either clear or obscure. An obscure concept does not definitely show one what a thing is, because it only supplies one with the qualities that a thing possesses in common with other things; whereas a clear concept shows one something so characteristically represented, that it cannot be confused with anything else, even though one does not arrive at a knowledge of its essence for the clear concept which is definite and characteristic as to what it refers to, may be only composed of a group of accidents or attributes. Now with regard to our knowledge of what God is, we have excluded the possibility of our having a quidditative concept, that is, a concept representing His essence as it is in itself. We can, however, have less perfect concepts of His essence, and we can form a very good idea of Him by forming a series of concepts after the fashion of this gradation of perfection in concepts of which Logic informs us. We can form a concept of God by a process of negation, of affirmation, and by attributing superexcellence to Him. We can, by way of removal, deny of God a litany of qualities involving imperfection and characteristic of created being. Moreover, we can predicate analogously of God a number of qualities that are common analogously to all being. And finally of what we affirm about God, and of what we place positively in God, as a result of excluding imperfection from Him, we assert perfection and excellence above anything that we can conceive. St. Thomas sums up all this by saying: "The invisible things of God are known by

way negation, the eternal power of God by way of causality, His divinity by way of excellence."

KNOWLEDGE OF GOD'S ESSENCE.

Let us proceed, therefore, to form our idea of God by way of negation. Ordinarily when our knowledge of a thing is restricted to the knowledge of what it is not, this must be admitted to be very meagre indeed, but according as we add to the list of things that we say the thing under consideration is not, our knowledge of this thing increases, and we may say that our knowledge of it becomes definite when we are able to exclude from it every category of being apart from itself. This is precisely what we do, and what we can legitimately do, when we are trying to form a concept of God's essence. Indeed this negative idea of God precedes all demonstration of His existence, for it underlies the nominal definition with which all investigation about God must begin. To begin the study of anything we must have at least a vague idea of it, corresponding to the term we use for it; as St. Thomas remarks: "We cannot know whether a thing exists, unless either perfect knowledge, or at least confused knowledge of what it is, is possessed by us." It is of the very nature of definition to express what a thing is, and by actually demonstrating God's existence we clarify the nominal definition of Him with which this demonstration must begin. After demonstrating the existence of God we conceive Him as the Unmoved Mover, the Uncaused Cause, the Necessary Being, the Supremely Perfect Being in every line of perfection, and the supremely intelligent Intellect. Thus we see what we must exclude from God, namely, all change, dependence, contingency, potency, passivity, imperfection, and indefiniteness of purpose. This process of removing from our idea of God imperfections characteristic of created being is explained by St. Thomas at some length: "In treating of the divine essence the principal method to be followed is that of removal. For the divine essence by its immensity surpasses every form to which our intellect attains; and thus we cannot apprehend it by knowing what it is. But we have some knowledge thereof by knowing *what it is not*; and we shall approach all the nearer to the knowledge thereof according as we shall be enabled to remove by our intellect a greater number of things therefrom. For the more completely we see how a thing differs from others, the more perfectly we know it; since each thing has in itself its own being distinct from all other things. Wherefore when we know the definition of a thing, first

we place it in a genus, whereby we know in general what it is, and afterwards we add differences, so as to mark its distinction from other things; and thus we arrive at a complete knowledge of the essence of a thing. Since, however, we are unable in treating of the divine essence to take *what* (quid) as a genus, and we cannot express its distinction from other things by affirmative differences, we must needs express it by negative differences. Now just as in affirmative differences one restricts another, and brings us nearer to a complete description of the thing, according as it makes it to differ from more things, so one negative difference is restricted by another that marks a distinction from more things. Thus, if we say that God is not an accident, we thereby distinguish Him from all accidents; then if we add that He is not a body, we shall distinguish Him also from a whole category of substances that are material, and thus in gradation He will be differentiated by suchlike negations from all beside Himself; and when He is known as distinct from all things, we shall arrive at an idea of Him that is characteristic and applicable to Him only. This idea, however, will not be perfect because we shall not know *what* He is in Himself."

"The whole Thomist position in the proofs for the existence of God depends absolutely and only upon the Aristotelian theory of causality, and further that the essential note of this causality is the formal likeness between cause and effect."¹

This profound observation reminds us that the principle of causality which underlies all the proofs for the existence of God includes not merely efficient causality but also exemplar or extrinsic formal causality, a fact which enables us to attain a positive knowledge of God, though not of His essence as it is in itself. The principle of efficient causality considered under its aspect of extrinsic formal causality is stated by St. Thomas thus: Every agent acts through its form, and consequently every agent produces what is like to itself. The likeness of effect to cause, is, in the instance of the First Cause and all created effects, only an analogical resemblance. In this connection it is well to remember that the IV Lateran Council declares the lack of resemblance between Creator and creatures to be greater than this likeness, so we are more unlike than like our Creator. Furthermore since our ideas are received from created things, that is, from things more unlike than like the Creator, it can be easily realised how imperfect is the idea we can

¹Rev. Hilary Carpenter, O.P., Cambridge Catholic Summer School, 1930, p. 207.

form of Him by piecing together with exclusions, reservations, and affirmations of supereminence the conceptions drawn by us from created being.

The negative process of forming an idea of what God is, leads us to declare His Simplicity, while the process of attributing perfections to Him, based on exemplar causality leads to the avowal of His infinite perfection.

THE SIMPLICITY OF GOD.

By the Simplicity of God we affirm that every kind of composition is to be excluded from Him. After enumerating all the possible kinds of composition, St. Thomas proves that no kind of composition can be found in God. The first question he asks is whether God has a body, or in other words he raises for discussion the problem of whether God is composed of spirit and matter. Although this does not seem to be of much practical importance to-day, it is a problem that for centuries vexed the minds of men, and its solution refutes the Anthropomorphism of the present day. Because God is the First Mover, Pure Act, and the most noble Being, it is clear that He cannot have a body, for the very idea of a body, namely, extended matter, involves change, potentiality and dependence. St. Thomas next excludes from God the composition of matter and form, because this composition involves potentiality, and ultimately would lead one to deny that God is the first efficient cause, for the first efficient cause must be primarily and essentially form, that is, pure actuality.

In the third place St. Thomas excludes from God the composition that arises between nature and suppositum, between essence and subsistence; God must be His own Godhead, His own Life, and whatever else is predicted of Him.² St. Thomas' next step is to prove that God's essence is His existence, so that the distinction between essence and existence, which in creatures is fundamental is excluded from God. Lastly St. Thomas excludes from God all accidental and even logical composition. This process of exclusion is followed by five arguments which prove that God is truly and absolutely simple. These arguments are based on the fact that God is Pure Act, from which all potentiality, dependence, and

²The revelation of the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity does not give rise to any conflict with this truth, for in the B. Trinity the divine nature is not multiplied, but the one and same individual nature subsists in Three Persons, which are not distinct from that nature, though really distinct from one another.

passivity must be excluded. As a corollary to the denial of all composition in God comes the assertion that God does not enter into the composition of other things; about which St. Thomas writes: "Since God is the first efficient Cause, to act belongs to Him primarily and essentially. Now that which enters into composition with anything does not act primarily and essentially, but rather the composite acts so; for the hand does not act, but the man acts by his hand . . . Hence God cannot be part of a compound . . . For no part of a compound can be absolutely primal among beings—not even matter, nor form, though they are primal parts of every compound. For matter is merely potential; and potentiality is absolutely posterior to actuality. A form, however, which is part of a compound is a participated form; and as that which participates is posterior to that which is essential, so likewise is that which is participated; just as fire in ignited objects is posterior to fire that is essentially such." This proof demolishes all theories of Pantheism, for Pantheism in some way or other makes God a part of created things, and is directly opposed to the Simplicity of God. Thus the process of removal, by which we first say what God is not, leads us to the concept of His Simplicity, and at the same time furnishes us with cogent reasons against Pantheism, which is one of the gravest errors to which the human mind is liable, for Pantheism is an error that has frequently reappeared under various disguises in the history of human speculation right down to the present time.

The ontological or objective value of our concepts, and their analogical applicability permit us to gain some positive knowledge of what God is, when we pursue the line of investigation opened out to us by our reflection on the principle of efficient causality, which includes exemplar causality. This enables us to deduce from the Simplicity of God, which is not the simplicity of emptiness, but the simplicity of Pure Act which is infinitely rich, the Perfection of God.

THE PERFECTION OF GOD.

"We call that perfect," says St. Thomas, "which lacks nothing of the mode of its perfection." Perfection means complete, but complete in the best way, so that a thing not only lacks nothing of the fullness of its nature, but lacks nothing that is required for the integrity of its nature, and for the exercise of its activity. A thing is perfect inasmuch as it possesses all that it should have, and is imperfect inasmuch as it lacks what it ought to have. Consequently what is perfect has the full

actuality that is its due, and what is imperfect is still in potency to what is still wanting to it. God, therefore, is perfect, because He is Pure Act, from which all potentiality, and consequently all imperfection are excluded. When studying the perfection of God we should be careful to remember that the perfection of which we have experience, and which comes under our immediate observation, is only relative perfection. God's perfection, however, is absolute; it is not the perfection of one order or mode of reality, it is the perfection of Being. "Since God is subsistent Being it follows of necessity that He contains in Himself the whole perfection of being All created perfections are included in the perfection of being; for all things are perfect; precisely in so far as they have being.' Because He is Self-subsisting Being, God possesses the perfection not of one or other line or mode of being, but the whole perfection of being. "God exists not in any single mode, but embraces all being within Himself, absolutely, without limitation, uniformly," and consequently possesses the perfections of all things, and is supremely perfect.

If God is supremely perfect, and possesses the perfections of all being, we can learn something about *what* He is by enumerating the perfections of being, and by applying to Him, analogically of course, the notions that we have of these perfections. Thus we can have some knowledge of God's essence by applying to the ideas of perfection that we acquire by contemplating the world around us.

There are, however, different kinds of perfection or types of perfection in the world. Some perfections in their definition involve no imperfection whatsoever, such as life, wisdom, and goodness, and these in their proper sense are attributed to God, though in Him they are eminently more excellent than in creatures. Other perfections which in their definition imply no defect, but connote opposition to an equally noble perfection, such as fatherhood and sonship, are also attributed to God, but only after divine revelation on the matter. We can declare that God is a Father, and that God is a Son. Other perfections there are, which in their definition include some defect or contrariety to a more noble perfection, such as reason and sense; and these are not to be attributed to God strictly. However, although these perfections are not formally predicted of God, they are said to be His virtually. For the nature of these perfections is changed when the defect they involve is excluded, yet because it is within God's power to

produce them in others, and in others actually are the result of His power, they are attributed to Him virtually. God possesses all perfection, and every perfection that we discover in creatures is to be found in some way in God—if not formally according to its precise constitution, at least virtually as within His power to produce. No perfection to be found in creatures is lacking in God, otherwise He would not be the universal measure of all.

GOD'S PHYYSICAL ESSENCE.

We conceive God as possessing an infinite number of perfections, and we say that the accumulation of all His perfections constitutes His physical essence. However, as we affirm that He is absolutely simple, and since we exclude all composition even logical from Him, the question arises as to what we mean when we attribute different perfections to Him. When I say that God is Just, do I mean exactly the same thing as when I say that He is Merciful? Is the difference merely a matter of words? Obviously when we speak of the different attributes of God we do not mean to say that there is a real distinction between them; on the other hand, however, the difference implied is more than a mere matter of words. It is to be observed that our reason can make distinctions for which there may be sufficient grounds in objective reality, or for which there may be no basis whatsoever in objective reality. Now this latter kind of distinction is merely nominal, and were we to apply it to the problem that is suggested when we predicate different perfections of God, we should have to admit that the difference between God's Justice and Mercy is only a matter of words. The other type of distinction, however, is really conceptual, so that it allows us to have intrinsically different concepts of the same objective reality. This real conceptual distinction may be based either on grounds supplied by the object under consideration itself, or supplied only by other objects, and from this difference of source for the grounds of the distinction comes a difference of concepts. For if the grounds for the distinction are furnished by the object under consideration itself, we shall be able to conceive one attribute or perfection of that object to the exclusion of all its other attributes; but if, on the other hand, the grounds for the distinction are supplied not by the object itself, but by other objects, when we conceive one perfection of that object explicitly all its other perfections will be connoted implicitly. Now it is in this last way that we distinguish the divine perfections. We conceive the physical essence

of God as an accumulation of perfections possessed in the highest simplicity, and yet we conceive each perfection as distinct from all the others. But the grounds for this are not either composition or distinction in God Himself, but distinction in creatures. God is Just, and God is Merciful; He is Justice and He is Mercy, and He is all His perfections, and He is all of them with infinite simplicity. Yet when we speak of His Mercy, or conceive His Mercy, we do not conceive His Justice explicitly, but only implicitly.

THE METAPHYSICAL ESSENCE OF GOD.

"Although it is not possible to know in a natural way what constitutes the Deity as it is in itself, among the absolute perfections which can be known in a natural way, is there not one, according to our imperfect way of knowing them, which is the fundamental principle of the distinction between God and the world and which is the source of all the divine attributes? If there were such, then we should be right from the logical point of view of our imperfect knowledge, were we to say that this perfection is what formally constitutes the divine essence. It would be in God what rationality is in man: the specifying principle which distinguishes Him from other beings, and from which His properties are derived. The divine perfections, as they are *in themselves*, though not distinct from one another, are all equal, in the sense that no one of them is more perfect than the others, each of them implying the others. But, inasmuch as they are distinct from one another according to our way of conceiving them, and are analogically like created perfections, it is possible to find a certain order among them, in that there is a first among them." (Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P.) St. Thomas seems to solve this problem in the following proposition which is fundamental in his treatise on the nature of God: "The divine essence is the self-subsisting existence, the self-subsisting Being." What constitutes the divine nature, therefore, is that which is presupposed for every being, self-subsisting Being in the plenitude of being.

GOD'S NAME.

We conclude, therefore, that although we do not know what God is in Himself, we know imperfectly what He is, without being able to conceive His essence in itself. "We cannot know the essence of God in this life, as He really is in Himself; but we know Him according as He is represented in the perfections of creatures; and the names applied by us to Him signify Him in that manner only." "We know God from

creatures as their principle, and also by way of excellence and of excluding defects, and in a similar way He can be named by us from creatures, nevertheless not so as to express by the name *what* belongs to the Divine Essence in Itself, like the name *man* expresses the essence of men as he really is, since it signifies the definition of man in his essence God has no proper name, or is said to be above description by a name, because His Essence is above all that we understand about God." "The affirmative and absolute names of God, such as *good*, *wise*, and the like express what God is, so far as we can understand Him. Since our intellect knows God from creatures, it knows Him as far as creatures are capable of giving a true and adequate representation of Him God possesses in Himself all the perfections of creatures, being Himself simply and universally perfect. Hence every creature represents Him, and is like Him in as far as it possesses some perfection; yet it represents Him not as something of the same species or genus, but as the excelling principle of whose form the effects fall short, although they derive some kind of likeness thereto, even as the forms of inferior bodies retail the virtue or power of the sun." Names therefore like *good* and *wise* signify the divine substance, but in an imperfect manner, even as creatures represent the divine substance imperfectly. "So when we say, God is good, the meaning is not, God is the cause of goodness, or, God is not bad, but the meaning is, whatever good we attribute to creatures pre-exists in God, and in a more excellent and higher way. Hence it does not follow that God is good because He causes goodness; but rather, on the contrary, He causes goodness in things because He is good; as St. Augustine says, 'Because He is Good, we are'."^x God is good, is wise, is just, is merciful; He is all the attributes that we predicate of Him. However, the name which God revealed as the one by which He would have Himself known points to self-subsisting being as the root of all the divine attributes. When Moses asked, "If they say to me, What is His name? What shall I tell them? God answered him, Tell them, *He Who Is*, hath sent me to you." The divine names are imposed from perfections flowing from God to creatures, among which is His Existence itself, from which comes the Name, *He Who Is*. Now since God's Existence is His Essence, which can be said of no other, it is clear that among other names this one specially denominates God, for everything is denomi-

^x S. I. XIII. 2. Eng. Trans. Vol I, p. 152.

nated by its form. And its reference to present existence, which above all properly applies to God alone, whose existence does not know past or future, makes the name, *He Who Is*, the most proper name of God.

Thus St. Thomas answers the question which when he was a youth puzzled him as he wandered through the cloisters of Monte Casino asking the monks of St. Benedict, "What is God?"

JEROME O'RORKE, O.P.



BOOK REVIEW.

THINGS IN ME THAT MAKE ME A BELIEVER. By W. V. McEvoy, O.P. The Advocate Press. Price, 1/6.

It was a happy thought that led Father McEvoy, O.P., to make his series of articles in the "Holy Name Monthly" available to a wider public than the Holy Name men. The series presents the traditional Argument from Design, as applied to the human body, in an attractive and instructive way. It should attract readers of all ages.

The booklet comprises twenty-two chapters. Each chapter contains a description of a part of the human body and its mode of operation, and leads to the conclusion of the Supreme Designer. Such titles as "Circulation of the Blood—Irrigation System," "The Switchboard of the Brain," "God made a Camera" (Eye), "Our Lubricated Joints," "The Living Bellows" (Lungs), give an idea of the popular way in which the matter is treated. Almost every chapter is packed with interesting facts and details. A feature which deserves special notice is the wealth and detail of the diagrams and illustrations.

It is a booklet which would be welcomed in every school library.

J.B.C.

Jocelin of Brakelond, and Medieval Monastic Life

"The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond," a manuscript now in the British Museum, is one of the few existing documents that tell of the great Benedictine Abbey of Bury St. Edmund's, perhaps the wealthiest, if not the greatest, of the medieval monasteries of England. The Chronicle is a thirteenth century manuscript written in quaint Latin by Jocelin, one of the monks. It survived the destruction of the monasteries and the scattering of their records to be hidden from popular gaze until Thomas Carlyle popularised it in his work, "Past and Present."

The Chronicle gives us some interesting views on monastic life during the rule of the famous abbot, Samson, who governed the foundation from 1133-1144. It is by no means an historical treatise, framed according to the laws of scientific history, but rather a gossipy manuscript, lacking all idea of chronological sequence. In fact it can be justly regarded as the written counterpart of the tales one monk would have to tell another about monastic happenings—tales that would be told just as they occurred to the mind. It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that mere gossip was the purpose for which Jocelin wrote. He himself tells us in his opening lines "That which I have heard and seen have I taken in hand to write . . . and I have mingled in my narration some evil deeds by way of warning, and some good by way of profit." Thus it would seem that the MSS. was destined to be a quasi-moral instruction, but for whom it was intended cannot be ascertained. Jocelin gives us a true Boswellian eulogy of the abbot Samson, and paints a clear and entertaining picture of his monastic days, of events seen through eyes that were observant and shrewd, but always human. Truth and sincerity shine forth from the pages of Jocelin and together with a simplicity of manner they constitute the charm of this ancient document.

But what manner of man was Jocelin? Carlyle sums him up as "Ingenious and ingenuous, a cheery hearted, innocent, yet ethical shrewd, noticing, quick-witted man"; a man "Of patient, peacable, loving, clear-smiling nature . . . A wise simplicity is in him, much natural sense; a veracity that goes deeper than words . . . A learned man, yet with the heart as of a good child."

That is practically the whole biography of Jocelin, for little else is

known of him. He appears to have been of Norman stock, and to have been born in the town of Bury St. Edmund's, taking his surname of Brakelond from one of the principal streets of the town. The date of his entry into religion is given in the MSS. as the year that the Flemings were captured near the town—a date that can be fixed as 1173, because in that year Robert de Beaumont, the rebel Earl of Leceister, landed in East Anglia at the head of Flemish troops only to be defeated and captured. Jocelin's life in religion was a long one. He was still alive, when the abbot Samson died in 1214, so he was at least 41 years a monk.

That Jocelin was a student is easily gathered from his Chronicle, for he quotes freely from the latin writers—Terence, Ovid, and Horace. Among his brethren he enjoyed a reputation for piety; a reputation undoubtedly deserved, because his knowledge of and veneration for the Holy Scriptures are evidenced from the familiar and sincere way in which both the Old and New Testaments are used in the MSS. At various times this pious monk held the post of chaplain to the prior and to the abbot; and in his later years was almoner. That is Jocelin as far as history will show him to us,—a delightful character, this “learned grown man . . . with the heart as of a good child”—one whose further acquaintance would be profitable, could but the gap of seven centuries be bridged.

Jocelin's Alma Mater is in ruins to-day. The foundation would seem to date from the early seventh century, for in the year 633 an East Anglian King, Sigebert, abdicated and entered a monastery he had founded in the Suffolk town of Beodricsworth—the modern town of Bury St. Edmund's. From that date until 903, when the body of the martyr king, St. Edmund, was brought there, little is known about this monastery. In 903 four secular priests and two deacons had charge of the shrine and about twenty years later, their number having increased to twenty, King Athelstan formed them into some kind of collegiate institute to look after the shrine. A century later King Canute deposed the seculars on the plea that they were negligent in their duty, and brought in Benedictines from Norfolk.

Various Popes endowed it with privileges, perhaps the most important of which was freedom from visitation by bishops or papal legates, a privilege valued and used to some advantage by successive generations of monks. Indeed exemption from visitation is something that at first sight appears to have been an obsession with the monks.

Upon a little consideration, however, their jealousy about this privilege becomes quite reasonable. The Abbey had lands, revenues, internal customs, and rights; and never a visit was paid by bishop or legate in which some interference in these spheres was not made. Then, too, the visitors always arrived accompanied by great retinues of priests, knights, and servants, all mounted; and all—men and horses—had to be fed and housed at the monks' expense—a burden on the revenues of no mean proportions.

The English kings—names such as Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror, and Richard Coeur de Lion—were great friends of the monks, and were accustomed to endow the Abbey with valuable property as a source of revenue, and with rich plate for the shrine of the saint. King Edward the Confessor was an especially good friend of the monks, and a great benefactor of the monastery, to whose patron saint he had great devotion. From Edward came the privilege of a Royal Mint, and much valuable property. John Lackland, brother of Richard Coeur de Lion, seems to have lagged behind his fellows in this matter. Jocelin relates that "King John, immediately upon his coronation, setting aside all other affairs, came down to St. Edmund drawn thither by his vow and devotion." Now, thought the monks, such action means something, the shrine will be enriched! King John has some purpose in all this. Hopes ran high, but Jocelin sadly continues, "But all he offered was one silken cloth, which his servants had borrowed from our sacristan, and to this day have not paid for. He availed himself of the hospitality of St. Edmund, which was attended with enormous expense, and upon his departure bestowed nothing at all . . . upon the saint, save thirteen pence sterling, which he offered at Mass on the day of his departure."

The Abbey's career was not always peaceful; sometimes it was attacked, and sometimes it was the attacker. About 1263 some Franciscans entered the abbey domains and built a cloister. This disconcerted the monks, who at the time were leaderless, owing to the fact that no successor had been elected to fill the vacancy caused by the previous abbot's death. "What shall we do," cried the monks, "to defend our rights?" They soon decided matters by having the Franciscan cloister pulled down. The Franciscans, who could not be expected to receive the treatment with good grace, appealed to the Pope, who rebuked the Benedictines. The latter, not satisfied, awaited their opportunity and appealed to the succeeding Pope, receiving a favourable judgment.

Counter-appealing was carried on by both sides until Pope Urban IV decided in favour of the Bury monks. The Franciscans knew then that they were beaten, and made peace by apologising to the Benedictines, and prepared to withdraw. However, the Benedictines, with equal goodwill, gave them land for a cloister within the abbey territory.

The Abbey was the subject of two big attacks. One in the Easter of 1292 was made by the townsmen of Bury, who reduced the Abbey almost to ruins. Nineteen were executed for this deed, and damages to the amount of £140,000 were awarded by the King, who later remitted all but a very small portion of this sum. The second attack came from an offshoot of the Peasant Revolt under Wat Tyler. Wat Tyler did not lead the attack on the Abbey, for he was in the London district, but the assault was carried out by the East Anglian peasants under a certain Jack Strawe. On this occasion the Abbey prior was beheaded.

The final catastrophe in the monastery's life occurred in 1539, when Henry VIII cast his greedy eyes in its direction. Hoping to ward off dissolution the monks granted Thomas Cromwell a pension of £10 a year, but all to no avail. The edict of dissolution was proclaimed; the abbot given a pension; the monks scattered; and the buildings spoiled. Under Edward VI the first of thirty Grammar Schools set up in England was opened at Bury. Some years later Queen Elizabeth sold the property to a certain John Eyre for £400. Later the property passed into the hands of the Hervey family, one of whom, Lord Francis Hervey, has done much valuable research with regard to the Abbey.

The Abbey was a feudal barony, as were all abbeys and bishoprics in medieval times—the times of lay investiture. As feudal lord, the abbot governed his district, taxed his people, judged them, and punished them; an arrangement alien to modern eyes, but the normal thing for people of those times. The abbot's rule was an accepted thing, otherwise the people would never have bowed before his might. An amusing incident, at least to our eyes, is given by Jocelin, and serves to give some idea of the way authority was used, and acknowledged.

The abbot Samson had allowed his servants and the townsmen to have a sports meeting in the monastery courtyard. Wrestling was numbered among the contests, but, unfortunately, tempers were keen, and "From words they came to blows, from cuffs to wounds." A general melee resulted. Samson was indignant at the brawling on cloistered property and ordered the offenders to appear before the chapel door,

stripped to the waist and barefooted. There they had to prostrate themselves on the ground and beg for mercy. The Abbot, very angry, was going to excommunicate them all, when someone pointed out that there were over a hundred men lying on the ground outside. Samson relented then, but directed that the offence should not go unpunished, and so everyone was to be whipped. This was duly carried out. The townsmen accepted the whipping as a penalty justly incurred and apologised to the abbot for their offence.

However, things were not well with the Abbey prior to Samson's accession as abbot. "To be sure," says Jocelin, "the rule and religious life and all pertaining thereto were healthy enough in the cloister, but outdoor affairs were badly managed, inasmuch that everyone under a simple and already aged lord did what he would and not what he should." Money was borrowed freely by the various office-holders, who had private seals for authenticating their debts. The Jews were the chief creditors, accepting as securities vestments and other articles of altar furniture. The situation was so bad that the debts could not be paid when due, and the Jews, cancelling the old debts, issued new contracts, doubling the amount owing. In this way a debt originally under £40 increased during 8 years to over £880.

There is no doubt that the Abbey revenues were squandered on frivolities and even on drinking bouts. Still the monks are not altogether to blame, because a large number of lay servants lived in the Abbey; only 80 out of 200 were monks, and the servants were guilty in these matters. However, the monks had control of the purse strings, and so should neither have taken part in the disorders nor allowed money to be wasted on them. They were blameworthy therefore to some extent, and the abbot Samson seems to have been of this opinion, too. After becoming Abbot he deposed one of his officials for offences in these matters, and in an effort to stamp the abuses out had all the buildings attached to the office demolished.

Rumours of the debts reached the ears of King Henry II, who sent a messenger to the monastery to conduct an examination into the finances. The enquiry was fruitless, because the monks would impart no information. The prior, too, was an obstacle, for speaking as it were for all he claimed that the rule was strictly kept. With regard to the debts he argued that they should cause no concern at all, because the Abbey affairs were always carefully attended to. No place could be managed

without some small debt; everyone had debts, as an examination of their neighbour's accounts would show. With this the royal messenger was content and took his departure, but at the Abbey things did not improve. Among the responsible ones there was no feeling of guilt, but rather a feeling of resentment at outside interference.

However, it must not be imagined that there were none in the community who were dissatisfied with the lax administration. There were, but past experience had taught them not to meddle. Jocelin as a novice rebuked his novice master, the future abbot Samson, for not taking some steps to have matters righted, but was met with the reply, "My son, the newly-burnt child dreads the fire; so it I will me and many others." Samson then went on to relate how a former prior and three monks had been exiled, and he himself had been imprisoned for attempting reform. He concluded with the remark: "... These things must be borne with for a time. 'Let the Lord look upon it and judge!'"

Harder days were not far off, for the abbot while riding fell from his horse and injured himself. A fever followed the injury, and "After being sorely tormented by the physicians who healed him not" the abbot died.

Their lord dead, the monks had two things to do. News of the death had to be sent to King Henry II, and arrangements had to be made concerning the revenues. It appears that the abbot, supreme in spirituals, was ruler only in part in temporals. He had his own revenues, kept his own house and servants, and had definite obligations with regard to entertaining various classes of guests. The convent—that is prior and monks—was similarly constituted. On the occasion in question the convent was allowed to keep its share of revenue, but the abbot's portion was claimed by the king until a successor should be elected.

The interregnum lasted fifteen months. During this time the prior ruled the house, but was lax and allowed things to be done in any manner whatsoever. In particular he closed his eyes to the doings of his friend the sacristan, who paid off none of his debts and neglected his work. Samson, then under-sacristan, performed his part of the work well—kept all his buildings in repair and spent his money to good purpose. His efforts did not escape notice, and the monks remembered it to some advantage when the election of the abbot drew on, just as they remembered the misrule of the prior.

Eventually Henry II ended the interregnum and directed that the

prior and twelve monks should come before him to elect a superior. This number was soon chosen, but the monks were uneasy. They feared they would not be allowed to elect their abbot, but would have to accept a nominee of the king's. Above all they were afraid that a stranger would be appointed over them. Such a thing would happen if the thirteen could not agree on a suitable candidate, for the king would then take the election into his own hands. At the instance of Samson, therefore, six of the older and wiser monks were chosen and instructed to write down the names of three whom they conscientiously believed to be fit for the office. The paper was to be sealed and taken by the electoral party. If they were to be allowed to elect, the paper was to be opened and used, otherwise it was to be returned to the six, who would destroy it. This was done, and the party set out, Samson among them, leaving the convent full of rumours about the likely candidates.

The party, graciously received by Henry II, were told to nominate three candidates and on pretext of consultation they withdrew and opened the sealed paper. Consternation appeared on their faces—the six monks had done their work conscientiously and had ignored the popular candidates. They had nominated Samson the under-sacristan first; a certain Roger who held the more exalted position of cellarer, second; and in the last place Hugh the third prior. Monks holding high positions and numbered among the electoral party were passed over and, says Jocelin, "Hereupon those brethren who were of higher standing blushed with shame . . ." However it was not in their power to alter things, but to palliate their injured feelings "By mutual arrangement they inverted the order of the names."

The list was given to the king, who discovered he did not know the three, and accordingly directed three more to be nominated. The sacristan, whom we have heard of before, nominated his friend the prior, and the prior to return the good office averred ". . . The sacristan is a good man." So these two and another monk were nominated. Henry now startled them by ordering three strangers to be nominated. The monks—anxious now—withdrew and selected three, but secretly agreed that if a stranger were chosen, they would refuse to accept him without the consent of their community.

Having considered the names, Henry told the monks to cross three out. For the monks this was a golden opportunity and one not to be lost, so off went three strangers from the list. The numbers were then

gradually reduced—some retiring, some being crossed out, until two rivals, Samson, the industrious under-sacristan, and the easy-going prior, were left. The spokesman for the monks, remembering the prior's misrule, did not want him elected, but did not like to speak out against him. He extricated himself from the difficulty by praising both men, but contrived to emphasise Samson's merits a little more than those of the prior. The ruse succeeded, Henry perceived the drift of their thoughts, and Samson was declared elected.

At Bury the news was received with mixed feelings. The industrious were pleased and hoped for great things. Others were not so pleased. Jocelin, speaking of the community prayers offered for the election of a worthy abbot, tells us "There were some among us, who had it been known who was to be abbot would not have prayed so devoutly."

Samson was blessed by the bishop of Winchester and arrived at St. Edmund's on Palm Sunday of 1183. He was lead barefoot into the abbey by the sacristan and the prior, and brought to the High Altar. Here the new abbot made a gift to the shrine of St. Edmund, and then prostrated himself before the Altar while prayers were recited. From the Altar he was led to the abbot's throne, where he greeted each monk with the kiss of peace, and the "Te Deum" was sung. After the ceremony a great banquet was given—the abbot alone entertaining a thousand guests.

This Samson, who left the monastery a minor official and returned its master, was a man of forty seven years, short of stature, with piercing eyes; an active man, never slothful, and temperate in all things. His nature was somewhat fiery but well-controlled. An eloquent speaker in two languages, his main concern was the matter spoken rather than the manner of speaking. In short he was every inch a practical man.

Such was the new abbot, and abbot he was from the moment of his election. As a monk he had seen much that was wrong, and the need for correction and the remedies to be applied were well fixed in his mind. He knew little about the legal side of his office, so he employed a knight, skilled in law, not only to help him, but to teach him, so that he would be able to fulfil his duties personally. For the rest he took his own counsel, and as we read in the Chronicle, "He . . . judged it beneath

him to require counsel at another's hand, as if he were not able to look after his own affairs."

Before attacking the abuses, Samson prepared his ground by having a complete inventory of the Abbey and its property drawn up. Then he had all necessary repairs begun; and increased production of crops by having more land cleared and put under cultivation. He took over practically all the revenue that belonged to the convent. He used it to some advantage and later returned the greater part to the monks.

Debts were a problem fraught with difficulties from both the monks and the money-lenders—from the monks because they borrowed indiscriminately, from the money-lenders whose clutches were so tight on the revenues. Samson's first step was to forbid private borrowing and to call in all private seals. Then he placed some of his servants over the various office holders with full authority. This was not at all to the monks' liking—to have laymen ruling in their stead, and to be left in the position of a mere-onlooker was humiliating. Still they all admitted that the system was reasonable since the abbot's own affairs were managed well, and since it would benefit everyone if the convent's finances were stabilised. Samson mitigated the system later, and gave the monks their authority, keeping the laymen on as advisers only.

To expedite matters Samson inaugurated a general reshuffle of office-bearers, and deposed one altogether. This caused storm clouds to appear, which became very threatening. Conspiracy was afoot among the monks. To a man like Samson this was not a problem to be afraid of. He effectively stamped the trouble out by calling a chapter, and almost literally hurled their past into their faces. Holding aloft the signed and sealed contracts—evidence of their past neglect, moneys borrowed to the amount of £3052 besides interest, all of which he had paid—he rebuked them. To this the monks had no reply and the trouble subsided. Finally Samson took all keys from the community forbidding anyone to have anything under lock and key, as being against the spirit of poverty, but he allowed them to possess up to two shillings each for charitable purposes.

Samson had a spirited body of monks under him. Mention has been made of resistance to his reforms, but the climax came when he gave a ruling opposed to one the prior had given. Feelings ran high this time. The prior, in a matter of litigation between the cellarer and the porter, had condemned the porter and deprived him of his stipends

in punishment. Samson reversed the judgment and ordered the stipends to be restored. The cellarer refused to do this, whereupon Samson forbade him any other drink than water until he obeyed. The cellarer however decided to drink water rather than comply, whereupon the abbot became angry and forbade him both meat and drink till he repented. Immediately on giving this order Samson went away for eight days, leaving the monastery in tumult; the great point of Benedictine life—obedience to the abbot in all things—was at stake. However, the wiser monks opposed the popular action. Their efforts, coupled with messages sent by Samson, threatening some, and soothing others, prevailed and the tumult subsided.

The abbot at first refused to return, alleging the monks had threatened to kill him with knives, but eventually returned and punished one or two to make his mind clear. The monks repented and humbled themselves before the abbot, begging his pardon. Samson, while receiving their advances with meekness, laid stress on their fault. He won their hearts by saying that he had gone away to allow his anger to cool. All became friends again, and the porter received his accustomed stipends. Jocelin says that on this occasion they all learnt not to oppose a strong man.

Samson could be fearless and adroit in defending the Abbey against outside interference. The Archbishop of Canterbury, a legate of the Holy See, once decided to make a visitation to the monastery while he was in the neighbouring region. No one at St. Edmund's wanted this, but all decided that should the bishop come, they would treat him with honour until such times as he tried to hold a formal visitation. Then they would oppose him. Samson saw a way out should the bishop be slow coming, which actually happened. The prelate hearing that he was to be received with honour, took it as a favourable sign, and did not hurry his other business along. When he did decide to go to St. Edmund's he received a surprise for Samson in the meantime (apparently a period of some months) had sent to Rome for, and received Papal exemption from all visitation except that of a legate "*a latere*." Samson furnished the bishop with a copy of the exemption, and the bishop passed the abbey by "fearing that the gates would be shut on him." Relations between Samson and the bishop became strained, but later both men took steps to come to peaceful agreement.

The Jews were a problem that Samson had to grapple with. They

were the chief money-lenders and held much of the monastery's property as securities. Relations between the Jews and the Abbey were strange. All the Jews' riches, and even the securities for Abbey debts, were left at St. Edmund's for safe keeping under the care of the sacristan. It was also the custom for the Jewish women and children to be given protection in the Abbey when any trouble against the Jews arose. This protection was apparently part of the abbey's feudal duty; and was performed frequently enough, for the townspeople often turned against the Jews. Samson, however, in 1190, obtained a royal edict banishing the Jews from the Barony of St. Edmund. He compensated them for loss of property, and allowed those who had debts to collect in the towns the right to come back for a few days to transact their business. Penalties of excommunication were threatened against any townsmen who harboured Jews. The edict was enforced with arms, and it is said some fifty seven Jews were massacred. On the surface this looks a harsh action. Jocelin calls it a proof of great virtue, and Thomas Arnold commenting on it is of the opinion that on the whole it was better for the Jews that it happened. The reason alleged is that Samson could never have effectively protected the Jews in any trouble (as he would have been bound to do), since he had only a small armed force at St. Edmund's.

With the townspeople Samson—Feudal Lord and Baron of St. Edmund's—had conflict now and then. His rule was exacting, so much so that he is said never to have refused what he was entitled to take. Still he was just and would listen to complaints, and would devise better schemes to take the place of less efficient ones. For instance, it had been the custom of the cellarer to collect a tax of a penny a year for the right to reap corn. This was collected by the cellarer who went from door to door. During Samson's time this official favoured the rich and collected his tax from the poor only. That was bad enough, but when he could not get his tax at some poor houses he would take it in kind—taking a saucepan or some similar household utensil. On one occasion he took a door away on his back, hotly pursued by the indignant housewife brandishing her distaff. This event brought the matter to a head, and Samson abolished the way of gathering the tax and substituted for it a fixed sum to be paid by the town officials.

From revenue he had stabilised, Samson endowed a hospital for twelve poor men and twelve poor women—the hospital of St. Saviour,

at Babwell, which to-day, like the abbey from which it came, is in ruins. Samson founded schools. He purchased houses with abbey revenue and gave them as lodgings to poor clerks. To maintain the school itself Samson endowed it with permanent revenues.

In his relations with his feudal lord, the king, Samson was loyal, yet fearless in maintaining his rights should the king overstep the boundaries of the feudal contract. He was particularly loyal to Richard Coeur de Lion, actually visiting him in his German prison, after the German Emperor, Henry VI, had taken him prisoner as he was returning from the Crusades. Samson also defended Richard's rights in England during his imprisonment. When John Lackland, the king's brother, made claims on the throne, civil war began in England, and Samson solemnly excommunicated all disturbers of the peace, that is John's party. So fearless was he in his denunciations that he became known as "The stouthearted abbot." Later he appeared at the head of a body of knights, flying his own standard, at the siege of Windsor in opposition to John.

Thus far Samson appears as a man of action, a man prudent but fearless, a man undoubtedly fitted to rule. But what of the religious side of his life? His calling and office would demand that he be pious. The Chronicle pictures him as a man of action and Jocelin even says that at the siege of Windsor he was more remarkable for counsel than for piety. But a deeper insight into the narrative reveals the presence of virtue in Samson's character for he could not have faced danger, could not have been so ready to forgive, to control his fiery nature without being virtuous. Jocelin does give occasional references to the spiritual side of Samson's life. One—his self-imposed penances for the liberation of the Holy Land, and another his devotion to St. Edmund the patron saint of the abbey. That only few should be given need not be surprising because Jocelin sets out to relate events, and events in the sphere of administration not in the sphere of piety. That he gives us a glimpse of the abbot's devotion to St. Edmund is due to his relating an accident that befell the saint's shrine, and in the glimpse we see Samson in a rhapsody of prayer to the saint.

St. Edmund was the centre around which revolved the life of the monastery. So great was the devotion to him that all done for or against the abbey was regarded as done personally to the saint. St. Edmund was an East Anglian King in the 9th century. He was vir-

tuous, just to his people, and a devout Christian. Refusing to fly from an onrush of the Danes about 870, he faced them bravely, and refused to consent to the terms they demanded, on the grounds that these were unjust and un-Christian. He was tortured and beheaded. The body was cast away, but was afterwards found, and a writer two centuries later says that the head was miraculously joined to the body. This is confirmed by Jocelin, who says that when Samson viewed the body, the head was joined to the body.

The sacred relics were taken to Bury about 903 and enshrined there. After the dissolution of the monasteries in 1539 under Henry VIII the body was lost. In 1901 bones were sent from Toulouse to England for the new cathedral at Westminster, purporting to be the bones of St. Edmund. Later, however, Cardinal Vaughan publicly admitted that the bones were not those of the saint. It is interesting to note that in Jocelin's time, three centuries after the saint's martyrdom, his body was perfectly preserved.

During Samson's rule the saint's shrine was damaged by fire, but was rebuilt and transferred to the High Altar of the abbey church. Here it was the subject of the monks' devotion. But how little did these monks think that one day the shrine would disappear, that the holy body would be lost, that their home would as a result of Henry VIII's onslaught be in ruins. A scattered mass of ruins—little else but the tower and main gateway remain intact to-day—laid out with gardens to attract sightseers. But that has been the fate of that great monastery. There, as Carlyle says, a visitor may from the evidence before his eyes conclude that a large building once existed. But hardly has he done so than Giant Pedantry—in the form of a guide—comes and prattles off long wearisome lists of dates, names, and figures, until the visitor is glad to leave—yes, leave without realising that those ruins once lived, were once a mighty monastery within whose walls lived men, who, though differing from us in circumstance of time and environment, were none the less truly human.

But Jocelin's Chronicle steps in to fill the breach and fills it well. Seven centuries have passed since Jocelin lived, but his Chronicle lives though its author and his home have gone. The Chronicle lives to give us scenes from medieval life. For this alone is the MSS. historically important, and not for any general historical data, for it contains none. Jocelin centres the whole work round the Abbey, and no one enters its

pages except in relation to the Abbey. He sees nothing beyond the monastery, but sees all with an outlook not narrow or imaginative, but human and true. The medieval monks of Bury live because of Jocelin's Chronicle.

Again, in this sketch naturally only few of the events given by Jocelin have been touched upon, but the Chronicle gives many intimate and instructive details of the daily routine of feudal life in a corner of England; daily duties carried out while in Europe the mighty struggle between Pope Innocent III and the German Emperors for the recovery of the Papal States went on; the struggle of Guelf and Ghibelline; while in England the barons, gradually becoming restless, finally built up their demands on King John—demands that resulted in the Magna Carta. For these details the Chronicle is of historical value.

Finally the Chronicle has an importance for Catholics in general because it is of great help in counteracting the "evil-monk" legends that are continually being revived. The monks of the Chronicle had their faults—for they were human—but they were still good men. Carlyle, in the hundred pages devoted to the Chronicle, sometimes laughs at them but never condemns them.

This conclusion is not a weak one, because the MSS. itself will support it. Jocelin, as he said himself, set out to give both good deeds by way of profit and some evil ones by way of warning. Hence he has selected evil deeds not as examples of the general tenor of life at St. Edmund's, but as examples that should not be imitated. Many of the troubles he relates, too, are given to act as a foil for the brilliance of Samson's strength and ability. Then again there were the cares to the monks' lives—the religious side and the feudal side, and *in the latter*, being really a business, of necessity produced difficulties. *Jocelin nowhere* gives the impression that he considered the religious life bad, and the whole known history of the Abbey supports him; only *in its history* was its spirit bad. Thus we may confidently agree with Jocelin when describing the disorders he says "To be sure the religious life and all pertaining thereto were healthy enough in the disorder."

T. ARMSTRONG.

Lay Apostles in the Forces

Recently in the English periodical, "The Month," there appeared an article, entitled "What They Feel About It," in which several Catholic Chaplains set down their experiences. Though it would be unwise to generalise from their accounts, still certain facts and problems seem to be common to them all. All are agreed that the war has shown how appalling is the "leakage" problem. It has revealed that in a great number of cases many were Catholic in name only, and sheds an interesting light on Catholic practice in England before the war. Here are some quotations on this point from some of the contributors to the Symposium:

"There is the problem of explaining why so many soldiers have gone for years without making their Easter duties; why so many men who have rarely missed their Sunday Mass have yet omitted to go to Confession or to receive Holy Communion at least once a year; why there is such a large crop of registry office marriages."

"On entering the services, everyone must put down his (or her) religion as a matter of routine. This enables the chaplain to seek out all the members of his flock and to discover all he can about them. It is not a very encouraging task. From personal experience I should say that 40 to 50% of those who register as Catholics are merely nominally so; they are Catholics who have never seriously practised their religion. Some of them have not even made their first Confession and Communion. Others made their first Confession and Communion in their youth, but have long ceased to frequent the Sacraments through sheer indifference, usually the result of mixed marriages or marriages outside the Church."

"The problem is a serious one and it does not augur well for the future of English Catholicism. Conditions differ widely, but, taking a general average, it would probably be a fair estimate to reckon zealous Catholics at 10 per cent., average Catholics at 30 per cent., and the rest as either indifferent or bad. This means that at least 50 per cent. are lost to the Church, or are in process of being lost."

One of the chaplains writes that he had to deal with from 80 to 100 new Catholic recruits each week. He made it his business to find out how many had not practised their religion in the past and his conclusion is: "I cannot remember any week in which I had less than 50 per cent. who had given up the practice of their religion for one or more years." Later this chaplain was transferred to another station. He met the men on their arrival and told them of the facilities for the practice of their religion. There was a splendidly appointed chapel with three Masses every Sunday. "There is consequently little excuse for non-attendance at Sunday Mass. Well, how do they respond? On the whole, quite well. About 60 per cent. of the Catholics who are free to go to Mass do so."

Many reasons are given to explain the falling away: mixed marriages, marriage outside the Church, the spread of Communism, Sunday work, the weakening of family life with parental selfishness and consequent lack of restraint among children, difficulties of contact with the clergy who are too few in number, the barrier that the circumstances of modern life tend to set up between the priest and his people. In the army itself the abysmal ignorance of even the most elemental facts of religion leads to the omission of religious duties if the least difficulty arises. Want of appreciation and understanding of the Mass and Holy Communion mean that they are easily neglected, and in any case there is a painful lack of initiative in finding out the arrangements for Sunday Mass. Then the pressure of the milieu is very great. The idea that religion can mean anything vital is quite beyond most of the non-Catholics, and they know little, if anything, about the life of our Lord, and look upon church-going (apart from compulsory parades) as something quite extraordinary and queer. Yet the Catholics spend all their time among these men, whose conversation frequently centres on religious topics—e.g., the existence of God, the problem of evil, birth prevention, confession, Mass, the post-war world, etc., and because of their ignorance these things make difficulties for very many of the Catholic men. In a word, it requires great courage to be a good Catholic, for he has to live his life in a thoroughly materialistic and “pagan” (though not positively hostile) atmosphere. “To appear different, especially in matters of religion, demands a considerable amount of moral courage: and here—it must be confessed—many a Catholic fails.” While recognising the seriousness of the situation now, and the real dangers that lie ahead, all the chaplains are agreed that they have magnificent apostolic opportunities, greater than anything granted to the Catholic Church in England for the past twenty or thirty years. They realize, too, that the really good Catholic (about 10 per cent.) should be used more because he could be a valuable apostle among his weaker brethren, and since a plan has been worked out in Australia for training the good Catholic in the army on simple and concrete lines, I wrote an article for an English periodical, outlining the method in use here. Because this method is not very widely known in Australia, it was suggested that it be written up for the A.C.R. It was pointed out, too, that such an article would be of interest and use to others besides chaplains, because the principles of Catholic Action, as adapted to life in the forces

can be, and are being applied, to groups in factories, unions, offices, schools, universities, and parishes.

The solution that has been arrived at in Australia is the organisation of groups or cells of leaders along Catholic Action lines. Why should such groups be formed? To answer that question, we go back to a more fundamental one: Why Catholic Action at all?

Let us begin by quoting Pius XI: "We grieve because the clergy is quite insufficient to cope with the needs of our times. This is so, either because in certain places it is not numerous enough; or because many sorts of persons, refractory to its beneficent influence, remain strangers to the counsels and precepts of the Gospel teaching." In modern life it is difficult for the priest to keep in touch with his boys who work in benches in high-speed factories, with men in workshops, with men and women and girls in factories, shops and offices. Many sections of social life are separated from the influence of the clergy, who in any case are often few in number. What is to be done? "Present circumstances indicate clearly the course to be followed. Nowadays, as more than once in the history of the Church, We are confronted with a world which in large measure has almost fallen back into paganism. In order to bring back to Christ these whole classes of men who have denied Him, We must gather and train from amongst their very ranks, auxiliary soldiers of the Church." The Church, therefore, calls upon her reserves, the laymen who were always meant to be apostles but had forgotten their vocation. The Pope creates a body of volunteers, of laymen, who in Catholic Action are given a definite commission to carry out any work assigned to them by the Hierarchy. "The apostles of the workers must themselves be workers; the apostles of the farmers must themselves be farmers."

Fundamentally there are the same needs, the same problems in the army and the same answer, too; the apostles of the soldiers must themselves be soldiers.

In many a camp, the Chaplain is appalled by the difficulty of getting to know his men individually, and of influencing in any practical way the environment of the camp or station—an environment that is at times hostile, sometimes barely tolerant, and always crushingly indifferent to religion and morals.* The Priest cannot be everywhere. Using all his

*For much of what follows, I am indebted to an experienced chaplain who has asked me not to give his name. I think that it would be very helpful and interesting if some of our hard-worked chaplains could contribute to a Symposium on the state of things in the forces in Australia.

energy he is conscious at the close of each difficult day that he has touched only on the fringe of the work that might be done. He may offer the Holy Sacrifice, preach fervent sermons, announce Confessions, go after the men, but he remains largely remote and out of touch with their vital struggles.

There will be consolations. Good, bad and indifferent will approach him at times. He gives them the word of advice, of encouragement, instruction or warning. They are impressed but they return to the old atmosphere. The bad lads and the weaklings must return to the environment that made them bad, that plays upon their weakness. You might as well cure a man and then send him back to a germ-laden atmosphere.

And new men are coming all the time. They flock to the camps from various parts of the country, from divers occupations. Many young Catholics are swept suddenly from the warm atmosphere of good Catholic homes and well-organised parishes. There are no longer the easy facilities for hearing Mass devoutly, no gentle discipline of sodalities; the good example and refining influences are lost. These boys had to give up so much that was routine in their civil life—there is a real danger lest they give up, along with it, the routine of their Catholic life.

So much depends upon the standards set by the maturer recruits. The new men dare not be singular—and so, bewildered and miserable, they accept the lower standards. Surrender of their more virile Catholicity must be part of the necessary sacrifice—there's a war on, and fervour and decency are peacetime luxuries. Soldiers must be "tough."

So much for the dangers to Catholics themselves; but there is much more at stake. In those camps Catholics are the "standard-bearers of Christ," the salt of the earth. In the Services, among the soldiers, sailors, and airmen, are the men that count for the future, and when peace comes these men in our camps to-day will be the men to shape the destiny of the country. This is the richest field for Catholic Action, and unless these men are trained now the Church will suffer to-morrow; on the other hand, if Catholics seize the opportunity presented to them, very much good may yet be drawn from the appalling evil of war.

Here in Australia a beginning has been made, and though we can point to no dramatically successful scheme, we do know that already Catholic Action principles have been applied in camps and stations and

that the results are encouraging. The experiment began in a simple way. A priest appointed as part-time Chaplain to an R.A.A.F. station could devote very little time to it. He found that a modified form of the Holy Name Society had been used with excellent results in some Air Force stations in times of peace. He tried it out, moving slowly at first, and used it to work up a general Communion on a given Sunday. Prefects were wanted, each course was asked to nominate its own leader, and with this authority thrust upon them the prefects rose to the occasion. The Chaplain then got the idea of forming these prefects into a group of leaders. He got them to come together once a week at night in his room. The idea of Catholic Action was explained to them, its inspiration, its history, its success all over the world, in Australia The need for it in camps to prepare for the future, to see that all had been gained in time of peace should not be lost in the stress of war It meant hard work, sacrifices There wouldn't be much glamour in it, but it was something worth doing—for the men, for Australia, and for God Most of the prefects caught the spirit of the movement, faced up to the necessity for sacrifice and quickly recruited the best potential leaders in each course. An N.C.O. instructor quickly became an ideal leader, and this band of prefects was gradually moulded into a Catholic Action cell.

The training of these leaders followed the general Catholic Action plan. The necessity for the fourfold formation, the spiritual, intellectual, active and social elements, was emphasised.

Without realizing it, the men fell naturally into the Enquiry method, and the form of the meeting followed naturally enough. As the success of the whole scheme depends on the proper use of the Enquiry method, a few remarks must be made about it. By means of it the leaders come to grips with the problems they meet day in and day out in their environment. One by one they tackle what is unchristian round about them, draw up a plan of campaign, so that little by little they may bring about the christianisation of the environment and thus transform those who live in it. For this they must do three things:

(a) Observe: They try to see the kind of life those round about them are leading, their problems and difficulties. They do not give vague impressions, but they gather facts.

(b) Judge: They compare what they have observed with what

ought to be, judging the facts they have gathered in the light of Christian principles. Thus, they learn what the attitude of a Christian ought to be to all the different things that go to make up life as they actually have to live it.

(c) Act: They discuss what action they can take to make things better, both as individuals and as a group.

It was not thought necessary to explain much about the technique of the Enquiry to the men. They were simply told that in order to find out what the group ought to do it was necessary to examine the situation. Some questions for an Enquiry were drawn up on the following lines:

1. The first Enquiry suggested itself:

What's wrong with camp?

What are the reasons for carelessness among Catholics?

Is the atmosphere in general hostile or merely indifferent?

If there were a few in each hut who were obviously, fearlessly, unself-consciously Catholic, would it make a difference? Could you, by careful observation, get an accurate idea of the difficulties Catholics must overcome if they are to remain practical?

At present, are your ideas based on accurate information or simply on impressions gathered but not analyzed?

2. Another Enquiry followed on the first:

Could you find out accurately how good or how bad are the Catholics in your course, or in your hut?

What percentage go to Mass, say prayers, receive the Sacraments?

Why don't the others go to Mass, etc.? Ill-instructed? Lazy? Afraid of comments?

Of the careless ones—how many were careless before coming into the service? How many have grown careless since enlistment?

What is the chief reason for growing careless?

Do you think it would be difficult to get them to return to the practice of their faith?

What remedies do you suggest?

Do you think example is important?

3. And a third opened up many thoughts:

What subjects do you think the Chaplain might stress in his talks? Sermons? Instructions? Lectures?

If new men found a vigorous spirit of Catholicity already established in the place, would it help them?

If they were met on arrival by Catholics—N.C.O.'s and privates—told about Catholic practices, times for Mass, etc., do you think it would help?

If you helped them in their work, steered them into safe companionships, showed them the best methods and places of recreation, would this help?

Could you do this without appearing to patronise, or "preach" to them?

These Enquiries were very successful and other groups who have since tried them have found they opened up wide fields for discussion,

study and action. Frequently men will not listen to lectures, but study will be pursued as long as it has its inspiration in action.

4. Other enquiries have been made on Prayer :

Is it hard to say prayers here?

What's a fair set of morning prayers? Evening prayers?

Do you think a man should kneel down at his bunk to say his prayers, or should he say them unobtrusively?

Could you get many to join you in this room at prayers in public, at morning? at night?

At one station in Australia a Catholic adjutant has instituted a compulsory parade for Catholics each morning at which he himself leads the prayers. What do you think of this idea?

A good subject for enquiries is what the men talk about, for from this the general attitude to religion and morality throughout the camp can be discovered. Campaigns have been started against the prevailing filthy talk, obscenity, blasphemy, with varying results. Comments and questions of Catholics and non-Catholics on marriage, birth-control and social questions supply many subjects for Enquiries and discussions. It is found that the men are eager to make up the answers to these questions for their own sakes and because of the influence they can bring to bear on others.

Easy Enquiry, if properly conducted, will lead directly to appropriate action, which will consist above all in the creation of an atmosphere of decent, Christian behaviour, but I give a list of various activities which the Chaplains report the leaders' groups to have succeeded in accomplishing :

Distribution of literature, newspapers, C.T.S. pamphlets, books.

Gaining members for sodalities, finding out *ne temere* cases, looking after the oratory or room where Mass is celebrated.

Preparing for Mass, testing the possibility of *Dialogue Mass.

Bringing non-Catholic enquirers to a priest.

Arranging a group of singers to lead Benediction.

Recruiting for a group or groups is important. With the assistance of the Catholic Welfare Organisation and similar organisations, arrangements can be made for providing comforts, billeting with Catholic families, introduction to Catholic social life in nearby towns or cities; similar assistance can often be given to wives and dependents of men living in strange surroundings.

General Communions in adjacent parish churches are a welcome variation of camp routine and camp environment.

The Catholic Welfare Organisation will often co-operate by providing * breakfast.

Benediction, too—plus supper—is usually appreciated, and very helpful.

*One English chaplain reports that to his surprise—the men like the Dialogue Mass. They are made to feel that they are actually taking part in the Mass and are not merely passive spectators.

With regard to the actual formation of the Group a number of Chaplains have made the following suggestions:

The group is a group of leaders, and therefore it will be small—between 4 and 10 members. It is to be an efficient working Committee. Its aim is not merely to discuss, but also to plan and carry out action. Efforts should be made to get a representative from each course or section, battalion, etc., so that the problems that face each can be discussed or at least exposed. The leaders must be selected, not elected. Sometimes the Chaplain can put his hands on half a dozen leaders at once, but more usually he knows a couple of good men. Then he puts the idea of a group to them and asks them to bring along one or two friends whom they can rely on. New members who join after the group is functioning will appreciate a personal welcome and explanatory talk from the Chaplain. Occasionally he will have to look hard to find one leader. Since he may see this man only rarely he may have to leave it to him to get the group going. The aim should be so to found the group that it can be got together in an emergency and do its job, even when the priest cannot be present.

For a start informality is desirable. We should not put people off the idea by letting them think they are committing themselves to a new organisation. Just call it "getting together a few of the lads," perhaps not mentioning "Catholic Action" at the start. The people selected as Leaders should be real leaders—men with energy, resolution, drive, and, above all, influence with the men. Not necessarily do the most devout ones make the best leaders. But the "devout" ones are not to be despised—often they can put you on to the real leaders. Remember—many of the best fellows won't come forward themselves. They will wait until they are asked to join. Generally they respond generously to an invitation, particularly if it comes from the Chaplain. They feel honoured to be thus selected.

As to meetings the Chaplains point out that though it is often difficult to find a suitable place, a priest and a few who are really determined to meet will always overcome this particular difficulty. Times of meeting must vary also. It will be ideal if the group can meet every week or every fortnight. It may happen that once a month is all that can be managed. Some determined groups who cannot have a regular meeting manage to get at least a number of the members together even

at an hour's notice—these can let the others know what was done and what action was planned.

At the meetings no rigid plan is likely to work, but it should be regarded as essential that:

(I) Some definite and practical spiritual formation be given. The chaplain will decide for himself the most effective means of making his men into enthusiastic apostles. Catholic Action has almost universally adopted the idea of the Discussion on the Life of our Lord (either in addition to or in substitution of a formal talk by the Chaplain). It is certainly a most effective means of making real and vivid the personality of Christ. Whether it is suited to camp conditions can only be a matter of experiment.

(II) A definite system of contacts be established and continued. Apostolic work is done by making Contacts. Each leader should give the name of one man whom he will concentrate on—either with a view of getting him into a group or generally keeping him on the right lines. At every meeting each leader should report briefly on how he is getting on with the men he promised to contact. This technique should be worked out carefully. This is the simplest and most direct form of Action.

(III) Definite investigations or Enquiries be carried out by the group to find out exactly what things are wrong in the camp and how they can be remedied.

ORDER OF MEETING might be:

1. SPIRITUAL: A short prayer;
FORMATION: A brief talk by the Chaplain
or
A discussion on the Gospel (though training is required for this).
2. BUSINESS: i. How can the group help the Chaplain.
ii. Reports on jobs undertaken.
iii. Can we help anyone in trouble.
3. ENQUIRY: Questions from last week answered.
Action if any decided.
Questions for next meeting drawn up.
4. Concluding prayer—for the Conversion of Australia.

As to the prayers to be said at the meeting, experiments are being made to discover the ideal form. The Creed is recited slowly and thoughtfully. The J.O.C. prayer could be adapted easily enough: "Lord Jesus, a worker like me" and the J.O.C. prayer for militants, "Lord Jesus, teach me to be generous . . ." has been found to be ideal. The prayer—The Soldier's Shield—to Our Lady of Perpetual Succour is said regularly. The habit of the Act of Contrition is inculcated. Unlike many groups of civilians, most of them insist on the Rosary. Finding it hard to get time for morning and evening prayers, they "go for" the group prayers almost hungrily. Often their work for Catholic Action will be depressing and results will be lacking, so if they say a lengthy prayer they will go away knowing that the meeting

has been worth while—no matter how depressing the reports have been, the meeting is a success.

A small booklet, incorporating the above suggestions, has been prepared and sent by the Chaplain-General to all Chaplains of the Forces. Many of the Chaplains have replied, saying that they now had a method and a technique that they had long been seeking. We are fortunate in Australia in having a National Secretariate of Catholic Action which has been able to supply to those who have not much experience of Catholic Action methods further information about the Enquiry and other points that might cause difficulty in the beginning. It has been found, too, that the military authorities place no obstacle, providing that the meetings are held at suitable intervals.

It seems to me that the organisation of cells among the men, working along the lines of this article, is what the Chaplains who contributed to the Symposium are looking for. It was suggested, for instance, "that groups of Catholic officers should meet from time to time to discuss ways of improving the Catholic spirit of the men." This, of course, would be very valuable when feasible, but the specialised methods by which groups of men meet to improve the Catholic spirit of their fellows is the one especially recommended by the Pope. Is not this the remedy for "lack of initiative," for what one writer calls the chief danger,—“emptiness of mind and aimlessness of purpose”? The definite system of contacts, by which the leaders will be ready to be friendly and helpful to others, should contribute to the solution of the leakage problem, to prepare the weaker ones to approach the priest, whose necessarily infrequent visits, therefore, will be most fruitful. The enquiry should help them to concentrate on the essentials of their faith, to bridge the gap between religion and life, to form a Christian outlook on the difficulties and problems of their lives as they have to live them from day to day. Their action, based on concrete facts, will be aimed at the solution of definite problems which they will tackle by measures within their capacity. The Chaplain will be able to give genuine spiritual formation to his group, and at the same time train them for militant activity. One of the writers called for an organisation on J.O.C. lines, and the scheme outlined is nothing but an application of the spirit and technique of that “achieved type of Catholic Action” (Pius XI) to the milieu of men and women in the armed forces.

It is recognised that, for the present at least, no large scale activity

is either possible or desirable. Without attempting any spectacular feats, our lads can do a tremendous amount for good by personal example, by influencing their friends and associates quietly and unobtrusively. What they need is positive encouragement by the priest to undertake the work, and a sense that they are not isolated; that many others are likewise working for Christ in this manner. If these fellows catch the flame they will always find plenty to do—and they will do it well.

All the Chaplains who wrote recognise that marvellous opportunities are offering. Here is a chance of helping those who are doing so much for our country, and of preparing them to do even greater things in "the laborious reconstruction of the morrow."

C. MAYNE, S.J.

*

*

*

*

BOOK REVIEW.

MARY OF BETHLEHEM AND OTHER POEMS. By Mary King. Pp. 40. Second Ed. E. J. McAlister & Co., Adelaide. 1942.

This is a second edition of the book published earlier this year under the title, "The Mass and Other Poems." That a second edition should be needed after so short a time is high recommendation—especially when we remember that verse has a smaller public than prose. The change of name is wise, I think, "Mary of Bethlehem" being one of the outstanding poems in the book.

E.G.

“——— or a Sodality of the Blessed Sacrament”

Decree 304 of the 4th Plenary Council of Australia and New Zealand, held at Sydney in 1937, may be translated thus:

“In every parish there shall be established the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine as well as the Confraternity OR A SODALITY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, in conformity with Canon 711 and the reply of the Commission for the interpretation of the Code of Canon Law given on March 6, 1927.”

The following pages will be concerned with “a Sodality of the Blessed Sacrament,” and more particularly with the Sodality better known as the People’s Eucharistic League.

The general procedure for the establishing of a church society or Sodality is indicated in Canon Law. It must be canonically erected or at least approved by lawful ecclesiastical authority. The Ordinary of the place has this authority. Every Confraternity must receive a formal decree of erection. The approbation is sufficient in the case of a Sodality or other pious union, unless the Sodality wishes to be affiliated to a higher association called an Archconfraternity or Archsodality or primary union. In this case it must also have received canonical erection. The affiliation enables the local Sodality to enjoy the spiritual favours and indulgences granted to the Archassociation.

Every society is to have its own statutes duly examined and approved by the Apostolic See or by the Ordinary of the place. Several Confraternities or pious unions having the same title and the same purpose are not to be erected or approved in the same locality, except in the case of large cities where this is left to the discretion of the local Ordinary. One exception to this law is given in the case of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and that of the Blessed Sacrament, which are to exist in every parish. There may also be a Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament and a Sodality of the People’s Eucharistic League in the same parish or locality, because the title and the purpose are not the same.

The difference between a Confraternity and a Sodality is given in Canon 707. This Canon begins by saying that an association of the faithful duly erected to perform some work of piety or charity is called

a Pious Union. If this Pious Union is constituted as an organised society it is called a Sodality. If the purpose of this organised society or Sodality is to promote public worship as well as to perform some work of piety or charity then it receives the special name of Confraternity. The difference between a Confraternity and a Sodality lies in the purpose of promoting public worship.

Both a Confraternity and a Sodality ought regularly to have a number of officers duly elected or appointed, as a head or president, and subordinate officers such as councillors, secretary, treasurer, and others. Men only may become members of a Confraternity and hence only men are eligible for its various offices. Women may be enrolled but only that they may be able to gain the spiritual favours and indulgences granted to the male members of the Confraternity.

The admission or reception of new members is to conform to the rules of law and the statutes of the particular association. In the case of a Confraternity or a Sodality the person must be present, must know that he (she) is being admitted and must have the will to become a member. It would follow that very young children and all persons who have not the use of their reason at the time cannot become members.

Any Catholic, whether a lay person, a Religious or a Priest, may become a member of a Confraternity or Sodality or Pious Union. The same person may be a member of several different societies. However, a member of a Third Order may not belong to another Third Order. The Code leaves it to the judgment of the Superiors of Religious to decide whether their subjects may join a given pious association.

The Director alone has the right and the power to admit or receive new members. He may not delegate another priest to act in his place unless this faculty was obtained from the local Ordinary. It is well to specify this in the statutes and in the decree of erection.

In order to prove that a person has been validly admitted as a member of a Confraternity or Sodality the full name must by all means be written down in the register of the society. This must be a bound book or album and not a looseleaf book or file card system. The one who has the right and power to admit new members is the one who has the obligation of inscribing their names in the album of the society.

When the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament have been legitimately erected in a Parish they are by Canon Law affiliated or "aggregated" to the Roman Arch-

confraternities of the same names. All other Confraternities and Sodalities must comply with further formalities if they desire affiliation. By affiliation all the communicable indulgences, privileges, and other spiritual favours granted expressly by the Apostolic See to the affiliating society are communicated in turn to the society that is being affiliated.

For the validity of the affiliation of a local Sodality of the Blessed Sacrament to the Roman Archsodality or primary association of the People's Eucharistic League it is necessary that the parish society should have been canonically erected; that it has not been affiliated to any other Archsodality; that the consent of the local Ordinary be given in writing together with testimonial letters from him to the Roman Primaria; that a duly authorised list of the indulgences, privileges and spiritual favours communicated be sent to the Sodality being affiliated; that the affiliation be in the form prescribed by the statutes and in perpetuity; and that the diploma of affiliation be sent “*gratis omnino*” although a charge may be made for necessary expenses. This charge is not to exceed three American dollars.

The first step to be taken to establish a Confraternity or a Sodality in a parish is to draft statutes for it. These statutes must indicate the name and purpose of the society, the means to attain this end, the organisation and officers, the duties of members, and, in general, how the society is to put its idea into effect. Suggested statutes for a Sodality are given in the appendix to this article. When the Statutes have been drafted they are to be sent to the Ordinary for him to examine and approve them. Once he has done so they may not be altered without his consent.

At the same time the Ordinary is asked to give the decree of canonical erection for this Sodality in the parish church. It is well to ask that the Parish Priest be named the Director of this Sodality and given all necessary faculties, especially that of delegating another priest to act as Director when necessary. The permission of the Ordinary should also be obtained for Exposition or Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament at the meetings of the Sodality and for public Holy Hours of Adoration.

In order that the members of this local Sodality may be able to enjoy the spiritual favours and gain the Indulgences granted to the Roman Archsodality of the People's Eucharistic League affiliation is necessary. The conditions for affiliation have been mentioned above.

The Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament at St. Francis' Church, Melbourne, have power to issue this diploma of affiliation for any place in Australasia. Printed forms for the various documents may be obtained from them at the same address.

While these formalities are being attended to a series of talks may be given to the parishioners telling them about the new Sodality that is to be started in the parish. Material for these talks may be found in the A.C.T.S. pamphlet, "The Golden Hour and the People's Eucharistic League," by Rev. William A. Fox, S.S.S., and in "The Divine Eucharist—The Real Presence," by Blessed Peter Julian Eymard.

A convenient date should be selected for the inauguration of the Sodality after the official diploma of affiliation has been received. This date should be announced a fortnight or two in advance. A neighbouring priest might be invited to give the occasional discourse. Leaflets describing the League and application forms on which prospective members could write their names may be obtained from the League headquarters in Melbourne and distributed among the parishioners.

These application forms might be handed in at the inauguration ceremony. The names are to be inscribed faithfully in the local register of the centre, otherwise the admission into the Sodality is invalid. The new members appreciate receiving a certificate of enrolment signed by their own Director, the Parish Priest. An attendance card or booklet on which to record the hour they spend in adoration will serve as a gentle reminder to them to keep their promise faithfully.

If no certificate of membership is given to members and if no check is kept on their fidelity to their promised monthly hour the fervour of the first month or two may cool off and even die out altogether. They are not obliged to attend the public Holy Hour. They may keep their promise by doing their hour privately on some other day at some other time. Even the best of us can at times forget, but if we have to hand in a report we take more precautions not to forget.

Members who are legitimately prevented from spending their hour in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament may satisfy their obligation by spending it elsewhere. Canon 935 gives their confessors power to commute conditions so that they may gain the indulgences also.

In this connection the attention of all the faithful may be called to the indulgences granted by the Holy See for "spiritual visits." (Cf.

Preces et pia Opera n. 122.) The faithful who are prevented from paying a visit to the Blessed Sacrament on account of illness or other just cause may perform this visit in a spirit of faith in their own home or wherever they may be, and by reciting six Paters, Aves and Glorias for the Pope's intentions may gain an indulgence of five years. If they perform this “Spiritual visit” under the same conditions every day they may gain one Plenary Indulgence once a week.

Wherever a church society is well organised with responsible and conscientious officers and regular meetings it is bound to flourish and do a great amount of good in a parish. This is true in general, and it is especially true for a society in honour of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. Moreover a society like the People's Eucharistic League has an end that is concrete and easily grasped by every Catholic. It is at once simple and sublime, the logical consequence of our faith. As Blessed Peter Julian put it: “Jesus is there! Hence, everybody to Him!”

This priest and apostle of the Holy Eucharist, founder in 1859 of the People's Eucharistic League, used to say that he would like to see “Eucharistic Fraternities” established around every Tabernacle in the world. Less than sixty years later his desire was embodied in the second paragraph of Canon 711, “that in every parish there should be established the Confraternity of the Most Blessed Sacrament.” Ten years later the Pontifical Commission for the authentic interpretation of the Code declared that a pious union or Sodality of the Blessed Sacrament might be established in the place of the Confraternity where particular circumstances made this advisable.

Finally, another ten years later, in 1937, the 4th Plenary Council of Australia and New Zealand decreed that “in every parish there be established . . . the Confraternity OR A SODALITY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT”

APPENDIX.

(The Statutes given here need not be followed in every detail, except with regard to the hour to be spent by members every month before the Blessed Sacrament. The rest is left to the judgment of the pastor, who best knows conditions in his parish. He may adapt, omit or add according to the needs of the particular locality.)

STATUTES OF THE SODALITY (FOR THE ADORATION)
OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT OR THE PEOPLE'S
EUCHARISTIC LEAGUE
IN THE CHURCH OF AT

Article 1.—The NAME of this society is Sodality (for the Adoration) of the Blessed Sacrament or The People's Eucharistic League. It is under the patronage of Our Lady of the Most Blessed Sacrament.

Article 2.—The AIM of this society is to see that Our Lord Jesus Christ truly present in the Most Blessed Sacrament for love of men has faithful adorers at His Feet, and loyal promoters of His Glory. This end may be expressed in the words of Blessed Peter Julian Eymard, the founder of the People's Eucharistic League. "Jesus is there! Hence, everybody to Him!"

Article 3.—The SPIRIT of this Sodality is a spirit of love similar to that spirit of love which prompted Our Lord to give Himself to us in the Most Holy Eucharist, offering Himself up for us in the holy sacrifice of the Mass, giving Himself to us in Holy Communion, and remaining present in our midst, day and night, in the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar.

In this spirit of love the members will be glad to keep their promised Hour every month before Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament.—They will try to hear Mass and receive Holy Communion frequently.—They will try to make a Visit every day, at least in spirit if they cannot do otherwise.—They will try to be present at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, at public Holy Hours, at ceremonies of reception of new members, and, in general, at all the public devotions of their parish.—

Other works that will appeal to members are:—the care of the Sanctuary and Altar, providing lights and flowers; the care, repair and even making of the Mass Vestments, linens and cloths for the Altar; the beauty and cleanliness of the exterior as well as of the interior of God's House; the teaching or preparing of children or adults for their First Communion; visiting the sick and preparing their homes or rooms for the coming of Our Lord; spreading Eucharistic literature; recruiting new members

Article 4.—The WAY to spend their Hour before the Blessed Sacrament is to look upon the Hour as a Visit with our Best Friend, Our Lord, Our King and Our God. They may find it helpful to divide

the Hour into four parts, spending one quarter in loving, admiring, praising and adoring Jesus; a second quarter in thanking Him for all He has done for them; a third quarter in making reparation to Him for the sins that they and others may have committed against Him; and a fourth quarter in prayer, asking Him for some special favour.

Article 5.—MEMBERSHIP in this Sodality is open to every practicing Catholic man, woman and child.

New members are to be admitted into the Sodality by the Reverend Director. This is usually done at a meeting of the Sodality before the Blessed Sacrament. It may, however, be done privately. The new members recite an act of consecration to Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, in which they promise to spend one hour every month before the Blessed Sacrament. This promise does not oblige in conscience under pain of sin. One or more members may recite this act of consecration on behalf of all the new members. The *full names*, the Christian names as well as the Surnames of the members **MUST BE INSCRIBED ON THE REGISTER** of this Sodality. This is absolutely required for the validity of membership.

Article 6.—This Sodality has two branches: one for the men and boys, the other for the women and girls. (Some parishes may prefer to have just the one Sodality including both sexes. Larger parishes may even find it advisable to have a third branch for children under 15 years of age.) Each branch has its own organisation and officers.

Article 7.—The Director of the Sodality is the Parish Priest or a Priest named by him. The Director may delegate another Priest to act in his place, even for the reception and inscription of new members, but only in particular cases.

Article 8.—Each branch is to have a Council to assist the Director in the government of the Sodality. (Where there are no branches it is more in keeping with the spirit of the Church for the Council to be composed only of men.) The Council is composed of a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, a Treasurer and three Councillors. These officers are to be elected for a term of three years and may be re-elected. The Director draws up the list of the candidates. Every member present at the election has a right to vote. This election takes place in the course of the same month every third year. (Some other terms of office and mode of election may be adopted.)

The members will be divided into groups of 24, each group having its own head chosen by the group itself and approved by the Director. This person is called Leader. (Smaller Sodalitys may have groups of 8 or 10). The Leaders help the Director keep in touch with the individual members of their respective groups. They may likewise be allowed to take part in a meeting of the Council.

Article 9.—A meeting of the Sodality is held every month, on the second Sunday for the women's branch, and on the fourth Sunday for the men's branch. With the permission of the Ordinary, Benediction may be given at the close of the meeting.

With permission of the Ordinary, the Blessed Sacrament will be exposed for a Holy Hour of Adoration once every month. All the members will try to be present at this public monthly Hour.

Every year, a general meeting of all the members is to be held on a convenient day. A report of what the members have done during the preceding year is to be read at this meeting.

A general Communion of all the members is to take place once a year on the Sunday nearest to the general meeting.

Meetings of the Council are held regularly every three months. A meeting of the Council may be called by the Director whenever he deems it advisable.

On days on which the Blessed Sacrament is to remain exposed for several consecutive hours, during the Forty Hours', after the Mass on Holy Thursday and until the "Mass of the Presanctified" on Good Friday, a roster will be drawn up of the members who are to follow one another every hour in adoration before the Blessed Sacrament. (In some parishes, this may be done even when the Blessed Sacrament is not exposed, so as to have at least one member present in adoration from the time the Church is opened in the morning until it is closed at night. For example, on First Fridays, Holydays of obligation, days of special devotion.)

Article 10.—A collection is to be taken up at every meeting of the Sodality. The money thus collected is to be used to defray expenses incurred by the Sodality with the consent of the Council and the approval of the Director. Some uses to which this money may be put are: to have a Mass offered for a member in good standing who dies; to provide for the upkeep of the Sanctuary Lamp, Candles or Flowers for the Altar; to assist discreetly members who may be in need; to

build up a Eucharistic Library; to provide suitable clothing for poor children making their First Communion, etc. Where the revenue warrants, a bursary may be founded to educate boys for the Priesthood, etc.

Article 11.—DUTIES of members. These duties do not bind in conscience under pain of sin.

1. Every member will spend at least one full hour every month before the Blessed Sacrament reserved in the Tabernacle or exposed on the Altar. If prevented from spending this hour before the Blessed Sacrament he (she) may spend it in some quiet spot as if in Church.

2. Members are to keep a record of their Hours, and hand it to their leader when required.

3. Members will be present at the meetings of the Sodality and at the general Communion.

4. Members will co-operate wholeheartedly with the Council and the Director in all their undertakings.

Article 12.—FUNCTIONS of the Officers.

1. The Reverend Director presides over all the meetings of the Sodality and of its Councils.—He does not vote, but he gives or refuses his approval to what has been voted upon.—He admits new members and inscribes their names on the Register. He checks the accounts and, together with the Treasurer, signs the cheques for the Sodality.—He signs the Certificates and other official documents for the Sodality.

2. The President assists the Director; takes the chair at meetings that are not held in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament. In the absence of the Director he (she) leads in the prayers that are recited together, e.g., the Rosary

3. The Vice-President acts in the place of the President when necessary, and in particular sees that the members are faithful to their promised monthly Adoration Hour.

4. The Secretary keeps the list of the members up to date, tabulates their reports of Adoration Hours, prepares membership certificates to be signed by the Director, keeps the Journal of all the meetings and ceremonies sponsored by the Sodality, takes down the minutes of Council Meetings, and prepares the Annual Report to be read at the general meeting.

5. The Treasurer collects the freewill offerings of the members and deposits all money with the Director. He keeps the books carefully,

entering all receipts and expenditures accurately in detail. He submits a financial report at every meeting of the Council. All cheques and statements of accounts must be signed by both the Director and the Treasurer. He also prepares a financial report for the year to be read at the general meeting.

6. The Councillors give their active support to the Director and to the President in measures that have been adopted, and assist them with their advice. Together with the Leaders, they enlist the active interest of the members in works undertaken by the Sodality and try to recruit new members.

7. The Leaders set the example for the other members in fidelity to their monthly Hour, in fraternal charity, and in interest and devotedness in all the activities of the Sodality. They collect the attendance reports of the other members when required, and visit the sick. The Leaders are not members of the Council, although the Director may admit them to its meetings.

END OF STATUTES.

W. A. FOX, S.S.S.

In Diebus Illis

II.

Dr. Polding set the young priests in their districts and left them to it. He was a very busy man and an active one, and had little time for nursing or coddling his missionaries. True, his advice was always there if they could manage to get it, but beyond that each had to think and act for himself. Lynch and Mahony had a Parish which embraced the present Diocese of Maitland and those of Armidale and Lismore with as much of Queensland as they could take in their stride. O'Reilly and Slattery had a territory which extended from Hartley North to the Back of Beyond, and West from Bathurst to Broken Hill. Brennan and Fitzpatrick at Yass and Goulburn, with headquarters at Yass, were attaching a parcel of country which stretched over what was then thought impassable ranges—The Great Divide—to the sea; and southwards to Bass Strait, that is until their horizon was limited by the appointment of Father Geoghegan to be their next door neighbour in the new Parish of Melbourne. A note on Father Brennan written to a Sydney paper by "A Bushman of the Wilds," which says he had been "labouring since his arrival without a hut of his own, travelling through the forests instructing blacks and whites scattered over hundreds of miles of country,"¹ might have been written of all of them. There was at that time no township or village of any kind between Yass and Melbourne. In 1839 Albury (Yarra-Wudah to the blacks) was mostly a native burying ground. It consisted according to a traveller's report of "Brown's shanty and about seven tents belonging to nomads."² The first house was built in Wagga in 1847.³ the year before Dr. Goold took possession of the See of Melbourne.

Having no establishment of their own to maintain, the early priests were at least financial enough to pay for board and lodging, they each received the government stipend of £150 per annum. Father Brennan's receipts—and that of the others—for 1838, a broken period being the year of their arrival, was £218/19/-, of which £150 was for passage and outfit.⁴ They could not expect much assistance from their

¹Australian, Sept. 19—1839.

²Andrew's "History of Albury."

³Gormly Exploration and Settlement in Australia.

⁴Wyatt Hist. of G'burn.

parishioners, all of whom, with the exception of a big man here and there like O'Brien of Douro and Fitzgerald of Bowning, were no better off than themselves. Still, many a family of ten in the old days was reared on less than £3 a week.

Before speaking of the impression the young Irish priests made on Australia, it is but fair to note the impression which Australia made on them. They did not see us at our best; but let us skip the convicts. They had read in their school books of the strange land underneath where everything was topsy-turvy—the swans black instead of white, the stone of the cherry growing outside the fruit, the trees shedding their bark and keeping their leaves, the North wind blowing hot instead of cold. Contrasted with the Green Isle they had left, where there was a cottage every few hundred yards, they found their new home a sullen brown land of immense distances and bare horizons. Untouched as yet by the hand of man it met their view just as Nature fashioned it or earthquakes moulded it. Rugged mountains stood like barriers before them,—not so high as mountains go, still higher than anything they had seen in the British Isles. Creeks that were flat clay beds when they passed along at the end of summer were raging torrents—miles wide—when they returned a few weeks later. There were forests where the trees shot up two hundred feet and stood so close together that it was impossible to drive a vehicle between them, or where the undergrowth was so thick that a horseman could not get through it. Settlers found a way through the Bargo Brush by following the tracks of strayed cattle, while the Winchecarribee Swamp was a bugbear to teamsters. Animals and birds abounded then, which have since been driven out-back or rendered partially or wholly extinct. Wombats burrowed in the streets of Bathurst. “Brolgas danced their minuet” at Goulburn; there were flocks of them at Araluen.⁵ Scrub turkeys built their extraordinary nests where Moss Vale is to-day. Kangaroos, of course, and emus: the latter were in mobs, except in the Manaro.⁶ Beasts that could not walk, birds that could not fly but could outpace the fastest horse amazed them. Koalas were on almost every tree and continued so for another 50 years. Daysuræ were just as common. Dingoes prowled or howled around every settler's hut. In fact every species enumerated and many more besides made raids on the settler either

⁵Vid. Bennett Journal of a Naturalist.

⁶Natural History of Manaro, T. and C. Journal.

through curiosity or malice,—even when the priest was staying with him. While dining, an emu's head would come in the hole which was a window and take the pannikin. Kangaroos bounded in one door and out the other. Possums and koalas slumbering in the daytime sagged, almost to the breaking point, the bit of hessian which served as a ceiling in the best room. Daysuræ raided his few eggs at night and handed over to goannas in the daylight. He named them all after something he thought they resembled in the Old Land, and in his wrath prefixed the word "native" to be purposely offensive;—"Native" Bear, "Native" Cat, "Native" Dog, etc., etc. Queer looking lizards were everywhere and snakes turned up at the most inconvenient times. Father Con Twomey was reading a burial service at Albury when a fierce black snake coiled around his leg, fortunately encased in the long riding boot of the period. With a young Irishman's reactions to that sort of thing he "let fly," and scattered the mourners. Then ensued what theologians of the time so much disliked—"venatio clamorosa." It ended in a kill, after which the business of the meeting was decorously proceeded with. That by the way. Gould, the famous "Bird Man," studied that world-beater, the Duck-billed Platypus, at a beautiful lagoon called Koroa (Grey Cloud) just below the site of the present Convent of the Sisters of St. Joseph at North Goulburn—the original Goulburn Plains.⁷ Bennett, the Naturalist, at the same spot learned much of what he knew of the many extraordinary waterfowl of Australia.⁸ Lagoon and Platypus and waterfowl have long disappeared and you would look in vain through all that country to-day for one of those weird animals of a weird land which delighted or terrified the new chum priests of '38.

Another feature which was new to them was the tracks they had to travel. Having gone no further than "up the old Boreen" at home, the long roads of Australia were a sermon on Eternity. The highways of the period were the wheelrutts made by the drays meandering in and out and round about as the bullocky steered his team from place to place. In winter they became quagmires and impassable bogs in the low lying spots. At one time over one hundred drays were bogged in the same locality between Mittagong and Sydney, and so hopelessly were they "down" that the drivers set up a miniature township where they camped for two months and played the Jew's Harp till the weather cleared. The

⁷World's News, 24..2/'26.

⁸Bennett, "Wanderings in N.S.W."

following from a Goulburn correspondent to the "Sydney Morning Herald" explains a lot:—"Mr. Murray despatched three drays laden with wool—value a thousand pounds—to Sydney. Some days after he went to Sydney, stopped there a few days, went to Launceston, Van Dieman's Land, stopped a few days, then to Melbourne. After two weeks there, he went to Port Fairy, then on to the Goulburn River, then to Port Phillip. He rode back to his own residence, and, after some days' rest, proceeded to Sydney, and overtook the carrier at Razor-back, having been three months on the road. The carriage was £18 a ton." There may be some sceptic among the readers of this who would suggest a "birthday" as the cause of the delay, but there is no evidence of that in the report.

That was the picture in winter. In summer it was a landscape of hard white glaring sunshine and a dusty track in the shimmering heat where trees threw no shade and creeks brought no water. The country was known only as far as the roads went and no-one knew what was to be met with further out. All manner of fantastic stories, the offspring of wild guesses and plain unmitigated lies, were circulated; and many an adventurer left his bones whitening in the scrub in the hopeless searching for what never was. Fields of yellow Mitchell grass seen from afar were interpreted to be ripening grain sown by happy whites who had escaped beyond the pale of care and trouble; and that belief that there were great things beyond,—or the rosier dream that somewhere there was a way out of the country by which he could escape from a doom of misery and despair led many a convict to his death in the inhospitable bush. Indeed, to dispel these delusions was the reason for the first expedition which went through the Moss Vale and Mittagong country to within sight of the Goulburn Plains; and Irishmen played their part in it. From among the prisoners sent out for their share of the rebellion in '98, many were escaping to find a settlement of peace and happiness which they believed existed somewhere beyond the Ranges. None returned, but this was taken as evidence of success. To prove to the men that the whole thing was a delusion and a snare, Governor Hunter sent out a party of them to search for that alleged settlement. Among them was a lad named Barrack, who kept a diary and marked the route. These diaries and maps, discovered in England over a hundred years later, proved that this boy who ante-dated Hume, Meehan, and Throsby had that in him which

might have made him one of our most successful explorers.⁹ The expedition found just what Hunter knew it would; but the delusion remained. In 1838 forty convicts were arrested at Gunning looking for the road to China.

The above may serve to give an idea of the conditions of interior Australia, when the young priests took charge of their parishes. Their first task was to get around among the people and to find out who was who, and what was what. The distance they penetrated into the out-back even in the first year is remarkable. Lynch and Mahony from Maitland were combing the country as far as Muswellbrook and Dungog. O'Reilly and Slattery, with Bathurst and Hartley as starting points, were going as far as Wellington and Dubbo—one hundred and twenty miles from their base.¹⁰ They were mustering about a dozen people at Summer Hill and Ophir, where there would have been thousands twelve years later when Hargraves made the first published discovery of gold in Australia. Brennan and Fitzpatrick were finding their way down the Murrumbidgee and up the Tumut Rivers and were visiting Boorowa, Queanbeyan, and what was then known as "Maneroo." There was not a single church or school twenty miles away from the coast, nor were there many buildings that could be used as substitutes. The courthouse where one existed, the back room of a store made shipshape for the occasion, a bark humpy were the first places in the country where Holy Mass was said. Sometimes the hard pressed priest availed himself of the offer of an inn, as wayside public houses were called in those days, and with commendable foresight but woeful tact gave the congregation the pledge before it disbursed. As a fairly decent counter punch the wily keepers of those shanties charged the priest a pound a night for accommodation for himself and his horse.

After having mustered his congregation the next thing to be done was to set about building a church for which a site had to be selected and funds raised. New to the country and having within his boundaries only an occasional man of substance it was a task which would have tested the capabilities of more experienced men. Not one of those churches, it would seem, was built of a piece. It was a matter of providing some place to be used for the celebration of the Divine Mysteries.

⁹Vid. R.A.H.S. Journal.

¹⁰Dom. Birt—Benedictine Pioneers.

so the sanctuary was run up and roofed in, leaving the rest to be added when funds were available. This accounts for the confusion of dates in connection with the opening of the first churches. In one report you may read "there is a church at such a place"; in another of the same date "a church is being built"; in yet another "a church is about to be commenced." Sometimes as much as two or three years elapsed between the laying of the foundation and the completion of the structure, and Mass was being said there all the time. But with what pomp and ceremony the stone was laid, or the building opened when there was enough to "open"! There were processions, if you please, though there were not more than twenty or thirty people to proceed. Holy rivalry also! At the laying of the foundation stone of St. Augustine's, Yass, on the Feast of the great Bishop of Hippo, in 1838,¹¹ there were present the first Australian Bishop, and no less than three priests—the biggest thing which up to then had been seen in that part of the Queen's Dominions. At Wollongong in 1840 John Rigney broke the record at a similar ceremony with a vast concourse from Dapto, Jamberoo and Shoalhaven. There was a procession in which the boys wore green rosettes, the girls green sashes, and the committee carried cedar rods. There was a band which wedged Tom Moore's "Sound the loud timbrel" in between the Adeste Fideles and O Sanctissima. And why shouldn't they! It was the planting of the seed of the Faith from the Land of the Faith, and there was no wish in any heart other than to see it grow. In the same year, Liverpool drew from the clergy and the laity of Sydney and gave everybody something to think about. In Bathurst, and Maitland too, Fathers O'Reilly and Lynch were laying in that same year the solid base which bears a mighty structure to-day, and poor Edmund Mahony was writing his name indelibly on the work he had to leave so early. "In 1840 Mr. Dodds bought two allotments and gave them to the Reverend E. Mahony for a chapel at Hexhan—— When Father Mahony arrived here and set out on his mission attending to his flock he endeavoured to erect in the different stations chapels and school houses, and succeeded in all places desired. Hexhan was the last."¹² He died five years later and is buried at St. Nicholas', Penrith. Nineteen years afterwards they brought to the same fitting resting place the mortal remains of his old shipmate—the kindly Michael Brennan—and laid them beside him.

¹¹Yass Correspondent, Sydney Monitor, 7th Sept., 1838.

¹²Chronicle, Dec. 28—1840.

All the many splendid churches, each on its little hill, throughout the Commonwealth to-day trace their ancestry back to those simple fanes of the late thirties and the early forties of the last century. A few of the latter are still in use after a hundred years of service:—St. John's, Richmond, Tasmania; St. Matthew's, Windsor; St. Nicholas', Penrith; St. Augustine's, Yass; St. Francis Xavier's, Wollongong; All Saints', Liverpool; St. Benedicts', Hartley; St. Bede's, Appin; St. Michael's, Bungonia; Holy Cross, Brisbane Water. Some of them have been added to, some of them stand as they were built. Long and narrow, with four straight walls as solid as the Rock of Cashel still, a high-pitched roof, a sanctuary and miniature sacristy at one end, at the other a porch or, maybe, a squat tower surmounted by a spire which resembles a tin extinguisher, they stand in a modern world like little quaint old ladies in bonnets and lace-up boots who have let the fashions pass. Revered by congregations who have heard their great grandfathers tell that the first time the old old gospel was heard in a wide New Country it was preached from their wooden altar steps;—with a thousand cherished recollections of the priests of '38 "opening up the Mass Book" or leading their people in simple devotions—the Rosary—the Litany—earnest prayers and earnest voices with the brogue still vibrant in their rafters, they see arising round them a more elaborate generation—Gothic Romanesque Byzantine—what you will—and envy none. For no matter what these may have by way of architecture and adornment, no matter what yet may come to them by way of antiquity hallowed by reverent memories and blessed associations they cannot claim the distinction and the glory of having been the first.

In making long trips through an almost empty country, where there were no roads or fences to act as a guide, the traveller had to depend altogether on his sense of direction, which, to the real bushman, is a sixth sense. Some men have it, some acquire it, and some are in bother to the end of their days. Dr. Polding had it and was proud of it. Father Brennan also had the gift. Fitzpatrick spent many a night in the open because of the lack of it; and Gould mostly went round in circles—at least before he was a bishop. In 1838, after finishing something of a Mission at Yass (and he was frequently so employed in the diocese) he set out for Queanbeyan, then attended from Yass—forty miles away. He started out gaily at 11 a.m., and at 10 p.m., famished and weary, asked for directions at a house—in Yass. Father Con

Twomey—Con of the Hundred Battles—had his trouble also; “The Reverend Father Twomey has been visiting this extensive district for some weeks past with the view of paving the way for the residence of an R.C. clergyman. Father Twomey had also some experience of bush life during the tour; by the time he returns to Albury he will have ridden one thousand miles. On crossing from the Murray to the Edward, with a view of making the Moulamein the good priest was bushed for the night sans food sans fire. He met on the plains a young Hibernian imported some sixteen months since direct from home—green as a budding shamrock. The youth offered his assistance to the priest as saddle bag bearer and his services were accepted as he said he was well up in mathematics and could take the sun’s altitude and ascertain the real position of the travellers. Relying on his guide’s rare accomplishments, Father Twomey found himself entangled in the bends and reed beds on the South side of the Edward River for the first night; on the second night (the previous frosty one having been passed in the bush as stated without food, fire or proper clothing to resist the cold) there was every prospect of the same uncomfortable plight when after sunset the sound of bullock bells attracted the attention of the wanderers, but the River Edward was between them and the bush music. The guide tried to cross the River. His logarithms failed him and his stomach was calling out loudly for beef and damper, so the erratic son of Erin lay prostrate on the bank. The good priest stripped, putting his shirt and waistcoat in his hat, his hat on his head, and tying his water-fold around his neck, swam across the River. On ascending the bank he discovered himself to be near Barratta Station—thirty-five miles from Moulamein—the hospitable abode of Henry Rikeston, Esquire. The dogs were aroused by the appearance of the priest in his singular costume, but the kindness of Mr. J. Wilson, superintendent, soon put Father Twomey in a more comfortable attire. The guide was brought over in a black’s canoe.”¹³ For all that the distances they covered were amazing, and amazing too was how they found their way. Father O’Reilly, at Bathurst, wrote the following in a private letter:¹⁴ “During my last journey I was led to proceed on from one sheep or stock station to another until I found myself three hundred and fifty miles from home. I found no residence but many stations and numbers of

¹³Deniliquin, Aug. 14, 1856.

¹⁴Birt, Benedictine Pioneers.

Catholics who often came from distances when they heard of me. I received above seventy to the Sacraments." A station in those days did not mean an elaborate homestead as we know it to-day. It was a tract of some hundreds of thousand acres of country with the sky-line as a boundary and scattered over it might be two or three shepherds' huts. Such a hut set down in the bush fifty miles away was hardly a dot on the map; yet he made it, and he new to the country. It was like a bushman done. Three hundred and fifty miles from 'Bathurst, if he went North, would bring him beyond where Narrabri is to-day, if West past Hillston or Griffith. Dean Hanly, the first resident priest at Moreton Bay (or, as he styled himself, the Parish Priest of Queensland), and who later on, after the death of Dr. Geoghegan, was offered, but did not accept, the bishopric of Goulburn, rode horseback from Brisbane to a synod in Sydney—most of the way by dead reckoning. Father Fitzpatrick, too, for all his want of bushcraft, journeyed from Goulburn to Tumut—over one hundred miles—to perform his first marriage:—"Marriage—By special license at the Tumut on the third instant, by the Reverend John Fitzpatrick; R. J. Shellye, Esq., to Maria Louisa, eldest daughter of Lieutenant Peters, 28th Regiment."¹⁵ Fitzpatrick on that occasion was escorted through the wilds by a black boy lent by O'Brien of Douro, who nine years before had done a similar service for Charles Sturt on his way round Bowring Hill to Jugiong, where that great exploratory expedition down the Murrumbidgee to the sea was begun. And thus again after many years:—"The Reverend C. Twomey got the Reverend Father Dillon to preach a sermon for the redemption of the church debt. Father Dillon was accompanied by the Reverend Dr. Fitzpatrick, V.G., of the Diocese of Melbourne, who visited this place from his Mission at Goulburn forty-two years ago, when the density of the forest which covered the site of the present township was unbroken even by a shepherd's hut, much less habitations, or water pretensions; the only house being Mr. Shelley's at Bombowlee (where one of the finest avenues of poplar trees in the world may be seen to-day) on the other side of the River. I believe I am correct in saying that the oldest Catholic resident here was far away when the young priest, Father Fitzpatrick, celebrated the first Mass at "St. Donot," then better known by aborigines than Europeans."¹⁶ On

¹⁵S.M. Herald, Oct. 22—1838.

¹⁶Tumut paper, Dec. 7—1880.

his way up he stepped aside to take a last farewell of an old yoke-mate of the early forties. "The late Father Roche was born in Kilkenny and arrived in this colony in 1844. He was ordained priest after three years in Sydney. For nearly thirty years he laboured in the Campbelltown district. For the last three years he had been ailing, and on the 9th Nov., 1880, he died peacefully at Mylora, near Binalong, the residence of his niece, Mrs. Garry. He was 70 years of age. The Reverend J. P. Fitzpatrick visited the good old priest."¹⁷ In the quaint old cemetery at Yass there is a modest headstone which bears the following: "Reverend J. P. Roche, O.S.B., died 9th November, 1880. Aged 70."

Towards the end of 1839 the first diocesan changes affecting the band that came in '38 were made. Dr. Ullathorne, dissatisfied with the management of the diocese from a business point of view, and threatening to resign, went to Sydney, where he took charge of the Seminary which, since its establishment about a year and a half before, had been in the capable hands of Father Charles Lovat. Brennan was brought down to take Ullathorne's place at Parramatta, and Lovat, who had had no missionary experience whatever, was sent in charge of Yass and Goulburn. When both Ullathorne and Polding went to Europe in the following year Brennan was given the responsibility of superintending the building of St. Patrick's, Church Hill, the foundation stone of which had been laid with much ceremony before the Bishop's departure. When in 1843 he was transferred once more to Goulburn, in the congratulatory speeches made at the send-off the hope was expressed that he would be as successful in building churches in his new sphere as he had been in connection with St. Patrick's. How that hope was realised will be set forth in its own place. John Fitzpatrick at the same time was transferred to Penrith and Liverpool, which were the scenes of his activity until the formation of the Diocese of Melbourne in 1848. He accompanied the new Bishop, Dr. Goold, to the Southern Capital, and when the history of that great Archdiocese is written his great work as V.G. and Adm., and his greatest achievement, the building of St. Patrick's Cathedral, will be recorded. At the end he was the oldest priest in Australia. He died in 1890, having spent fifty-two years in the country. He is buried at St. Patrick's.

There seems to exist in some quarters an impression—that is where there is any impression at all—that the early priests in Australia

¹⁷Tumut paper, Nov. 20—1880.

were men of no scholarship, just culls, so to speak, who managed to scrape through with a modicum of knowledge which rendered them fit enough for the bush, but of no service anywhere else. The slander probably took its rise from a letter written by Father John Brady, taxing a certain bigot for refusing to honour a promise of a donation to a charitable cause. The letter certainly had some queer twists in spelling and grammar, and gave a chance to the scribes of the time to pitch the epithet "hedge-priests" up and down the columns of unfriendly papers. As was pointed out by Dr. Ullathorne in defence, Father Brady had spent nineteen years in a French settlement and had really become a stranger to the idioms of his own language.¹⁸ For all that there were no hedge-priests amongst the planters of the Banner in Australia. Cardinal Moran well shows that Archdeacon McEncroe was a man of considerable learning.¹⁹ The pamphlet, "The Wanderings of the human mind in searching the Scriptures," which he wrote when stationed at Norfolk Island—"a complete concise history of the origin and growth and condemnation of the principal heresies that had risen in the Church in the course of the centuries, which the author traces to the unauthorised and perverse interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures" showed a very ready knowledge when one considers the small chances he would have of consulting approved authors in a place like Norfolk Island. Dr. Eris O'Brien, in some arresting pages, shows that Father Therry was not a hedge-priest.²⁰ It is interesting to learn that the pioneer in the busy life he was forced to lead should have the urge and the facility to compose hymns. The biographer, it is true, does not praise them highly; but then there are not more than half a dozen good hymn writers in the language. Of the men who came in '38, no less than four received Rome's appointment to bishoprics, while two others were in the running—Lynch for Brisbane and Butler for Hobart. Three—Fitzpatrick, Rigney, and Lynch—were made Domestic Prelates. John Fitzpatrick, when he volunteered for Australia, was rated in the Diocese of Dublin with Edward McCabe, afterwards a Cardinal.²¹ His career in Melbourne stamps him as one of the leading men of his time. Michael Brennan—the gentlest soul that ever had to mix with rough men in rough conditions—was a noted preacher and platform speaker. His

¹⁸J. J. McGovern, John Bede Polding.

¹⁹History.

²⁰Life of Archpriest J. J. Therry.

²¹Cardinal Moran—Hist.

addresses on education had great force in moulding the opinion of his day. In 1846, at an anti-transportation meeting in Goulburn, which was addressed by such distinguished orators as W. C. Wentworth and Major Lockyer, the speech of Father Brennan was the high-light, and became the battlecry of the anti-transportation party. It was printed verbatim in a special supplement of the "*Sydney Morning Herald*."²² Slattery was an outstanding orator; and the echo of his famous "flashing sword" speech on the education question in Melbourne, 1872, has not yet died away. Dean Coffey, who came in '42, was able later to issue a pamphlet containing all the scripta and dicta on the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Father D. J. Darcy, a bush curate in the late fifties, was appointed a professor of logic at St. John's. Later he started out on a holiday to Ireland, and spent it doing mission work in the slums of London. Father Twomey—the immortal Father Con—the Apostle of the Murray, the first resident priest of Tumut, the man who first moved for the building of a church at Mittagong, and one of the most exemplary priests who ever came to Australia—the whole six feet two of him—learnt German in four months so that he could preach to the Germans of Albury in their own tongue.²³ When Dr. Polding visited the Border on what turned out to be a triumphant tour of his diocese in 1858, he was escorted into Albury by a procession singing hymns in German; and there was Father Con in their midst, and as melodious as the rest of them. Patrick Bermingham, after seven years of rough bush work round Colac in Victoria and in the Southern parts of New South Wales—from '54 to '61—while cooling his heels in Rome in 1862, awaiting the hearing of a case in which he was interested, sat for the Doctorate in Divinity and made it. He was appointed professor of moral theology at Carlow, and afterwards was made vice-rector. His sermons at that time attracted as much attention in Ireland and England as they had done here, and were again to do when he returned thirteen years later to the Bush he loved so well. "We are happy to learn from a letter received by the last mail, in which was enclosed a clipping from "*Le Correspondant*" of the 25th September, that an eloquent sermon delivered in Liverpool by Reverend Patrick Bermingham was quoted by Count de Montalambert (author of the *Monks of the West*) in his magnificent oration "a Free

²²G'burn Chimes.

²³Empire, Oct. 26—1857.

Church in a Free State" before the assembled Catholics of the world at the Catholic Congress held lately (Aug. 1863), at Mechlin."²⁴ Father Patrick Dunne, the first priest to say Mass on the Ballarat Goldfields, left in 1850 a professorship at an Academy in Ireland to make one of the early priests of Melbourne—the fifth to be exact. Returning to Ireland in 1857 he was appointed by Bishop Cantwell to the presidency of St. Brigid's Classical Seminary, Tullamore. When the American Civil War left stranded farmers evicted by the landlords of Meath, he brought to Australia the fathers and mothers of the fine Catholic people of the Darling Downs. Later on he was appointed the first President of St. Patrick's College, Goulburn. The professor of Classics in old St. Pat's at the time was "little" Father Gallagher, afterwards the Bishop, the first priest ordained—1869—from Maynooth for the Foreign Missions. On one occasion at a symposium of the Illuminati of the University of Sydney the little "hedge-priest" was called on, without notice to reply to an address which had been read in Greek. Being young and raw he thought he should respond in kind, so tossed *ex tempore* Greek around for twenty minutes and skittled the lot of them. One could go on through a long list—Tennison Woods, the Quirks, Placid and Norbert, etc., etc., but let this much suffice.

JOHN O'BRIEN.

²⁴Yass Courier, Feb. 3—1864.

Liturgy

I. MYSTERIES OF THE ROSARY TO BE SAID ON SUNDAYS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is it of obligation to say the Glorious Mysteries of the Holy Rosary at evening devotions on Sundays, the Joyful Mysteries on Mondays and so on, according to the customary distribution? I have been accustomed for many years to announce the Sorrowful Mysteries on the Sundays of Lent, in the belief that it helps to keep the passion and death of Our Saviour before the minds of the faithful during the penitential season. A colleague has informed me that I am not free to make this departure from custom, arguing that it is of obligation to use the Altar Manual, which, of course, sets out the usual arrangement of the Mysteries.

SENESCENS.

REPLY.

It is not of obligation to observe the custom in question, and so SENESCENS is acting correctly and laudably in saying the Sorrowful Mysteries on the Sundays of Lent. The argument advanced by his colleague concerning the new Altar Manual cannot be sustained.

Authority for this statement is provided by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences. When a third part of the Rosary is said, as is usual, the choice of mysteries is declared to be perfectly free. In the same decree it is stated, however, that the custom is to say the Joyful Mysteries on Mondays and Thursdays, the Sorrowful Mysteries on Tuesdays and Fridays, the Glorious Mysteries on Sundays, Wednesdays and Saturdays.

"Estne libera electio mysteriorum quae recoli debent in recitandis coronis B.M.V. aut dantur diebus strictè determinati pro tali vel tali genere mysteriorum recolendo, ita ut tali die determinato recoli debeant mysteria gaudiosa, tali die dolorosa, tali die gloriosa?"

R. Affirmative quoad primam partem; quoad vero secundam, invaluit consuetudo ut per gyrum cujuslibet hebdomadae singula mysteria ita recolantur, nempe gaudiosa in secunda et quinta feria, dolorosa in tertia et sexta, gloriosa tandem in Dominica, quarta feria et sabbato."

The fact that this customary arrangement of the mysteries is set out in the most recent Altar Manual does not induce any radical change

in the situation. It is true that this Altar Manual should be used, as its compilation was ordered by the Third Plenary Council, which also laid down in advance that such Manual should be used exclusively. (Dec. 551a.). It was not, however, the intention nor the scope of the Council to go beyond the terms of the decree of the Congregation in regard to this particular item.

*

*

*

*

II. VEIL OF CIBORIUM.

Dear Rev. Sir,

When should the ciborium be covered with the veil? According to Fortescue it must be veiled when on the altar awaiting consecration. I had always understood that an unconsecrated ciborium should not be veiled. I would like your opinion on this point.

CHAPLAIN.

REPLY.

A study of both the law and its commentators fails to resolve the question of whether a ciborium should be veiled while on the altar awaiting consecration. The law, expressed both in the Code of Canon Law (Can. 1270) and in the Roman Ritual (Tit IV, Cap I, 5), states that the ciborium in which consecrated particles are reserved for communicating the sick and others should be covered with a veil.

"*Particulæ consecratae, eo numero qui infirmorum et aliorum fidelium communioni satis esse possit, perpetuo conserventur in pyxide ex solida decentique materia; eaque munda et suo operculo bene clausa, cooperta albo velo serico et, quantum res feret, ornato.*" It is not stated explicitly, however, that the ciborium is not to be covered in this manner when it does not contain consecrated particles. It may be concluded then that there is no definite direction in law. Similarly, liturgists do not agree on the course to be followed.

It seems very reasonable to leave the ciborium unveiled while it contains unconsecrated particles. For the significance of the veil seems to be that it may indicate the Real Presence. That such is its purpose may be judged from the context of the law, in which the various directions enumerated are all directed towards ensuring due reverence to the Blessed Sacrament. Confirmation of this view is obtained from the analogy of the Tabernacle veil, which is used only when the Blessed Sacrament is reserved in the tabernacle.

Reverting to our correspondent's original question, "When should the ciborium be covered with the veil?" it may be disputed whether the ciborium should be veiled immediately after the Consecration and Elevation of the Host or when the ciborium is being placed in the tabernacle. Again it seems a reasonable solution to wait until the ciborium is to be placed in the tabernacle. In the first place, practical considerations favour this course as a certain amount of distraction and inconvenience may be involved in arranging the veil immediately after the Consecration. Furthermore, even though the veil signifies the Real Presence, it is in accordance with the spirit of the liturgy that the ciborium be left unveiled for this brief period, during which the Sacred Host is present on the corporal or on the paten and the Precious Blood is contained in the chalice, covered only by a pall.

*

*

*

*

III. VEIL OF MONSTRANCE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Do the rubrics require the monstrance to be covered with a white cloth when on the altar, both before and after Benediction?

CHAPLAIN.

REPLY.

This question was asked of the Sacred Congregation of Rites and the reply was given in the affirmative.

"Must the monstrance be covered with a white veil while it stands on the altar before and after exposition of the Blessed Sacrament?

Reply: Yes." (Dec. Auth. 4268, 7.)

*

*

*

*

IV. DISTRIBUTING HOLY COMMUNION IN BLACK VESTMENTS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

When Holy Communion is given before or after a Requiem Mass, should the Blessing be given? I have heard it remarked that it is not becoming to give Holy Communion in black vestments. Is this correct?

SACERDOS.

REPLY.

(1) The first query is decided definitely in the negative by the Roman Ritual.

"Quod si contingat proxime ante vel statim post Missam privatam aliquos interdum communicare, tunc sacerdos planeta indutus, sacram communionem ministrabit eis modo quo fit extra Missam . . . , omissis tamen semper 'Alleluja' et benedictione in fine, si paramenta nigri coloris adhibeantur (Tit. IV. Cap II, n 13).

(2) The second query proposed by SACERDOS recalls the old controversy as to the licitness of distributing Holy Communion in black vestments. A definite decree of the S. Congregation of Rites of 27th June, 1868, settled the question in the affirmative. In a preamble to this decree the history of the controversy is outlined. The question was first considered by the Congregation in the year 1683: "Non esse contra Riturū ministrare Communionem in Missa de Requie vel post illam cum paramentis nigris, omissa benedictione si administraretur post Missam" (Dec. Auth. 1711, ad 2am). This reply did not settle the controversy. Some maintained that only particles consecrated in the Requiem Mass could be distributed to communicants. Again, in some places, the custom arose of celebrating Requiem Mass in violet vestments, so that Holy Communion could be distributed not only during but also before and after the Mass. With a view to settling these several doubts the general decree, referred to above, is very explicit:

"Posse in Missis defunctorum, cum paramentis nigris, Sacram Communionem fidelibus ministrari, etiam ex particulis praeconsecratis, extrahendo Pyxidem a tabernaculo.

Posse item in paramentis nigris ministrari Communionem immediate post Missam defunctorum; data autem rationabili causa, immediate quoque ante eandem Missam; in utroque tamen casu omittendam esse benedictionem.

Missas vero defunctorum celebrandas esse omnino in paramentis nigris; adeo ut violacea adhiberi nequeant . . . "

*

*

*

*

V. ANTEPENDIUM OF THE ALTAR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Are we obliged by the rubrics to have an antependium in front of the altar?

CHAPLAIN.

REPLY.

In the Rubricae Generales Missalis, amongst the rules for the construction and ornamentation of the altar there is the following:

"Pallio quoque ornetur (altare) coloris; quoad fieri potest, diei festo vel Officio convenienti."

This regulation is set down side by side with other requirements, such as that the altar must be consecrated and covered with three cloths, that a crucifix and two lighted candles must be placed upon it as well as a cushion or stand for the Missal. From this it may appear that the use of the antependium is obligatory.

It may be argued with good reason, however, that the obligation is not universal. In view of its purpose, it may be safely maintained that there is no necessity for having an antependium when the altar is of marble or is otherwise sufficiently ornate. This view is confirmed by the widespread custom, which persists without any rebuke from the Holy See.

*

*

*

*

VI. HOLY COMMUNION TAKEN PRIVATELY TO SICK IN HOSPITAL.

Dear Rev. Sir,

May a chaplain to a hospital or a charitable institution use the faculty of taking Holy Communion to the sick privately (i.e., without attendants or lights) on occasions when it would be inconvenient to observe the usual ceremonies?

CHAPLAIN.

REPLY.

Yes. The fact that the chaplain ordinarily takes Holy Communion publicly to the patients or inmates does not deprive him of the right, established by custom and force of circumstances, in this country, to take Holy Communion privately on certain occasions. In fact the tenor of official pronouncements and of approved commentaries is that frequent Communion of the faithful is a more important consideration than the public carrying of the Blessed Sacrament. Accordingly it is commendable that Holy Communion be taken privately in order to provide for the more frequent Communion of the sick. It is, of course, quite conceivable that reasons of convenience would suggest this procedure in certain cases, even in the Catholic Hospital or institution. It

is taken for granted that due reverence is observed just as when Holy Communion is taken to a private home or to some public or non-Catholic institution.

There is a relevant decision of the Congregation of the Sacraments of the 16th Dec., 1927, which, however, is unlikely to have more than a remote bearing on local conditions. For the sake of completeness, though, and in order to show the mind of the Church regarding Communion for the sick, it may be well to recapitulate the divergence of opinion which prompted the query in response to which the decision was given.

Canon 847 states the general law regarding the carrying of Holy Communion to the sick. Holy Communion should be brought publicly to the sick, it is stated, unless a just and reasonable cause exists for its being brought privately. In countries in which it was customary to bring Holy Communion publicly, a question arose as to who was the judge of this "just and reasonable cause." Was it the priest administering the Sacrament or the Local Ordinary? Some canonists maintained that the priest was the competent judge, basing their opinion mainly upon the terms of Canon 849 1, which declares: Every priest may bring Holy Communion privately to the sick with the permission, at least presumed, of the priest who has charge of the Blessed Sacrament. Some Spanish Ordinaries, considering their rights to be jeopardised by this current teaching, submitted the question to the Congregation of the Sacraments.

The reply was that the Ordinary is the competent judge. But the "mind" of the Congregation was appended to the reply as follows:

"If according to common experience and judgment there exists in the diocese or in any particular place no objection against the bringing of Holy Communion privately to the sick, Ordinaries must be on their guard lest by rules that are too rigorous or too universal requiring that Holy Communion be brought publicly, or by reserving to themselves the faculty of giving permission in individual cases, they withhold from the sick the solace of Holy Communion, even daily."

JAMES CARROLL.

Book Reviews

THE PERSON OF JESUS. By Father James, O.F.M.Cap. M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd.

This is a collection of essays centreing in the Person of Jesus. The book consists of a hundred and twenty-six pages, and is divided into the following chapters: Preaching; Person; Disciples; Prayer; Compassion; Sacrifice; Intimacy. The aim of the work is to establish the conviction that Jesus, true God and true man, Who lived in Palestine, lives now and still offers His friendship to those who would know and love Him.

The preaching of Jesus is first considered, since it was in His Public Life that Jesus manifested Himself to men. The chapter is finely done, especially the appeal of Jesus, "Come to Me all ye that labour, etc." The next chapter deals with the Person of Jesus, the Second Divine Person made flesh; necessarily it is a more difficult chapter than the first. This is the fundamental dogma of Catholicism; it is to the Church and to the Gospels we must go for knowledge of Jesus. From the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union and an analysis of the concept of beauty it is deduced that Jesus is "beautiful above the sons of men." "Nothing . . . but beauty is compatible with One Who was God in human form and Whose human nature was the flowering of Mary's most pure virginity under the influence of the Most High God." (p. 30). As a consequence, the humanity of Jesus is ideal humanity, God's idea of perfect humanity. The conclusions from John xx. 14, xxi. 4, Luke xxiv. 16, seem of insufficient strength, especially compared with Matthew xxviii. 9 and 17, Mark xvi. 12 and 14, John xx. 20 and 29, xxi. 12, to prove the author's theory that the glorified Humanity roused no memory in the imagination of the Disciples; and the author himself appears to abandon his own conclusion in a later essay (cf. p. 119). The conclusion is supported by a Theological Argument: portraiture is the expression of personality and of the Second Divine Person there can be no portrait in the ordinary sense; the humanity of Jesus is the portrait of God, but, because that humanity was God's ideal of humanity and therefore in a certain way universal, it did not impress a characteristic image on men's imagination. This conclusion is connected in an interesting manner with the doctrine of the Mystical Body (pp. 31-2).

The author proceeds to study the Person of Jesus in His dealings

with His Disciples. Why these were first called and not others, receives beautiful treatment. They were men; but in the company of Jesus they discovered the secret of their power: the consciousness of their nothingness. They learned "the prevenient love of God . . . which convinces us only to make us enter upon that new phase of existence in which we effectively learn the creative power of union and communion with God in a growing likeness to the Perfect, Jesus." (p. 43). The patient training Our Lord gave them is well developed.

The prayer of Jesus is a manifestation of the Hypostatic Union; the more we understand the prayer of Jesus, the greater shall our knowledge of Jesus be and the deeper our insight into the nature of prayer itself. The author at first attacks the difficulty: How could Jesus, Who is God, pray? He advances four reasons why it was fitting that Jesus should pray. First: creation reaches its plenitude in the human intellect of Jesus: there alone "all the works of the Lord bless the Lord"; so that even apart from Calvary Christ is truly the one Mediator. Second: because Jesus is God's idea of human life, He is a model of prayer. Third: He prayed in order that the union in Him of Divine and human nature might be made visible to man: "No one could listen to the prayer of Jesus, and mark the intimacy of it, without sensing the fact that He and the Father are one, one in nature that is divine, and one by the ineffable Hypostatic union of His human nature with the divine in His Person." (p. 59). Fourth: for the human mind recollection is a necessary preparation for prayer; so "it is not inconceivable" that Jesus show us Himself in search "of a human way out of the world of action, the better to emphasize His native liberty for the concentration of His entire humanity on God in prayer." (p. 60). Of these reasons, the first,—which presupposes a whole theory of intellection—, alone seems to us to contribute to the purpose as outlined, namely a greater knowledge of Jesus and a deeper insight into the nature of prayer. The hours of prayer spent by Jesus away from men are, to our mind, explained in too peremptory a fashion: "If the Master disengages His senses from their contact with the world around Him, and envelops Himself in the darkness of the night, it is to plunge His soul in the Ocean of Divinity, so that His very senses themselves are flooded with its waters. . . . we marvel that the earth sustained within it the Transfiguration that must have happened" (pp. 61-2). The elements of the prayer of Jesus are better treated, in particular adoration, though

we consider that the statement that man is "a recapitulation of all other things beneath him" (p. 67) could do with some elaboration. The Holy Ghost is a Spirit of Prayer (Roms. viii. 26) and through His Spirit Christ prays in us, while as High Priest He prays for us, and as God He is prayed to by us.

The compassion of Jesus is the gentleness of His strength. The contrasts in Luke xiii. 31-5 and Matthew xxiii. are fittingly brought into prominence. Christ is God Who can draw good out of sin itself; He was "gentle in regard to human frailty" but "unflinching before systematic wickedness"; the story of Peter's denial is finely told by way of illustration, and is well set in its place in Christ's training of Peter. These pages are admirably done; there is a particularly fine passage on the tears of Jesus (p. 81). From Jesus the Compassionate, Who looks on the world, the world to-day can learn the true idea of strength if it will but heed His look.

The chapter on Sacrifice opens with a fine exposition of St. Paul's "*Semetipsum exinanivit*" (p. 90). The Mystical Body is introduced with the thirst of Jesus on the Cross and sustained in the treatment of the Mass. This latter is too condensed in our opinion for meditative reading: the author speaks of "... the Consecration in which fire from heaven, in the Act of Christ, consumes the gifts and so transforms them that they cry out to heaven the death of Jesus upon the Cross" (p. 94), but it is not till two pages later that we learn that this crying out of the death of Jesus consists in the mystic separation of the Precious Body and Blood. From the Mass the author passes to consider what Christ's love demands from us in return. "If love is a giving, then perfect love means perfect giving" and the perfect way of love is the religious state (pp. 97-8). As the Mass is the death of Christ in the Sacramental order, the author contends that so "religious profession is another effective way of keeping alive the death of Christ" and of fulfilling the prophecy of Malachy (p. 100). His arguments rest on the "constant tradition, founded on solid doctrine that Religious profession within the Church is a second Baptism" (p. 99); now Baptism looks forward to the Holy Eucharist; it involves, as a sacrament, a reference to the Passion; and it confers an indelible character which implies a participation in the Priesthood of Jesus (p. 100). We think that the parallelism between Sacramental Baptism and the Religious state is made too close. However, the concluding paragraph of the section (p. 102) sums up in a simple and effective manner the practical import of the discussion.

The Saints, by reason of their intimacy with Jesus, are the hope of

our modern world. They have known the Person of Jesus and are on fire with His love. Though we "stand outside this sacred awareness of the divine" we are not prevented from knowing its secret. Since we know it is intimacy with God Himself, we can suspect its sweetness. "We can mark its origins and trace its progress and learn that initiative lies with God" (p. 109). The author takes St. John the Evangelist as an illustration. His conclusions concerning the days before St. John enjoyed the company of Jesus appear a little forced: the time of preparation in the Baptist's company receives treatment out of proportion to available facts; but the story of the Disciple that Jesus loved is well told. St. John serves also to show that intimacy with Jesus means intimacy with the Cross. The Saints find joy in their sufferings and their sufferings in turn are a hope for humanity. On this note the chapter ends, to our mind, somewhat disconcertingly, with two brief and complex statements: Saints who share Christ's sufferings "can sweeten, to the taste of God, the bitter waters in which humanity finds itself immersed," thus making mankind,—we infer—, more one with Christ, —for the author goes on at once to state that "men are loved by God . . . not for the sake of men so much as for the sake of Him in Whom all men are destined to be united." (p. 126).

As will already be clear from what has been said, "The Person of Jesus" contains undoubted excellences, and therefore forms a notable addition to English theological literature in general and Christological studies in particular. Of the style little can be said, for this type of work is new in English and can claim a style of its own. At times is manifest a tendency to oratory which loses some of its force in print.

Our main criticisms of this work as a contribution to devotional literature reduce to three heads. The vocabulary at times is unmitigatedly technical. Certain speculations, more beloved of theologians than of the laity, seem out of place. Reasonings are often too compressed or take much philosophical acumen for granted. On these grounds we consider that the book for the average person is one that is to be tasted only.

H.G.W.

*

*

*

*

THE STORY OF BISHOP SALVADO, by John T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D. Pp. 64. Patterson's Printing Press Ltd., Perth. Price, 2/6.

Dr. McMahon, of Perth, has again put us in his debt by issuing a goodly booklet on Bishop Salvado, one of the founders of New Norcia and its wise and prudent ruler for many years.

One of the two photos inset, shows the Bishop as the missionary equipped with swag and Crucifix bound for the scene of his labours, the other shows him in later years with whitened beard framing a strong face and eyes still blazing with enthusiasm—even from the printed page. So might one of the Patriarchs of old have looked.

The real Salvado is perhaps more truly given us in the photo than in the book. The advertisement says that the book "should be read by every Australian. A story of pioneering days, of devotion to a cause. Suitable for students, scholars and others." That wide scope is the book's principal limitation. It treats Bishop Salvado as just another of the great path-finders, men who opened up the country at tremendous self-sacrifice.

In his gracious foreword, Professor Walter Murdoch seems to feel a lack, without knowing what that lack is. He hopes that by the centenary of New Norcia—in 1945—there will be a completion of the work, covering the period of Dr. Salvado's later administration.

But the veritable Salvado was something immeasurably more than a pioneer, something far finer than a mere administrator. He was a man after God's own heart.

Reading Dr. McMahon's book whetted an appetite for more knowledge of his hero, and that knowledge is enshrined in the Bishop's own work, translated into French from the Italian in 1854, under the title, "Memoires historiques sur l'Australie et particulièrement sur la Mission de Nouvelle-Nursie."

There the man of God manifests himself not only occasionally, but almost in every line, and reveals the power by which the tremendous engine that was Salvado kept going. A complete simplicity, a delightful sense of humour basked by an unbounded confidence in Divine Providence—sometimes clearly visible—supplied the drive.

Very, very rare in these days, that book deserves translation into English; and since Dr. McMahon has discovered a real hero and has delivered him to us so sympathetically in a booklet that is too short and hampered by its own scope, he might do us the further favour of making available to all Australians the full story of the Benedictine missionary, who, without purse or scrip, but with Pauline intrepidity, broke his way into the heart of the Australian bush and won his way into the hearts of the despised aborigines *ut in omnibus glorificetur Deus*.

J. McG.